5

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

CHRYSOSTOM'S HOMILIES AGAINST THE JEWS
AN ENGLISH TRANSLATION

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

BY

C. MERVYN MAXWELL

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

MARCH, 1966

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS iv

PREFACE TO THE TRANSLATION v

- The Text on Which the Translation Is Based
- Principles and Practices of Translation
- Guidelines for This Present Translation
- Other Translations
- Acknowledgments

INTRODUCTION xxxi

- The Man and the Times
- Analysis of the Sermons
- Problems in Sermon iii
- The Problems of Sequence and Dating
- The Footnotes

Sermon

I. DANGERS AHEAD 1

- Judaizers and Anomoeans Need Similar Medicine
- Why the Jews Are to Be Considered Wretched
- Why a Synagogue Is No Better Than a Theatre
- Our Duty to the Judaizers
- Holy Books Do Not Make the Synagogue Holy
- Proof That Demons Inhabit the Jews
- Objections Answered
- An Appeal for Decision and Action

II. ALL OR NOTHING. 40

- Why the First Sermon Was Preached So Early
- With Law and Grace, It Is All or Nothing
- The Law Was Useful Once, but It Has Been Superceded
- The Christian's Responsibility for a Judaizing Wife
- A Sharp Rebuke in Closing

III. PRESS TOGETHER (AGAINST THE PROTOPASCHITES) 53

- Another Disease Has Broken Out Among the Flock
- Paul Regarded Schism as the Most Serious of All Complaints
- The Ignorant Protopaschites Ignore the Whole World
- Why Christ Kept the Passover
- Why We Observe Lent
- True Communion Depends on the Conscience, Not on the Calendar
- Let Everyone Work for Peace and Unity

IV. BOTH PLACE AND TIME 80

Another Jewish Fast Is Coming!
God's Will Makes All the Difference
Judaizing Christians Must Take a Stand
God's Will Respecting Time and Place
All Christians Must Save the Lost at Any Cost

V. PROPHECY FULFILLED. 108

The Previous Sermon Reviewed
Christ's Prophecy about Jerusalem and the Temple
The Jews and Old Testament Prophecy
Old Testament Prophecy and the First Three Captivities
Old Testament Prophecies Regarding Jerusalem and the Temple Today
The Evidence of Three Attempts to Rebuild the Temple
The Prophecies about the New Sacrifice
An Appeal for Action

VI. THE CROSS THE CAUSE OF THEIR WOE. 168

Why an Anti-Jewish Sermon Is Appropriate on a Martyr's Day
The Previous Sermon Reviewed
The Slaughter of Christ Explains the Jews' Current Distress
Proof that God Has Abandoned the Jews
Fulfilled Prophecy Proves the Crucifixion a Crime
Judaism Has Lost All Its Ancient Sacredness
An Appeal to Shun the Old Temple, to Become a New One, and to Help Others Do the Same

VII. CHRIST AND MELCHIZEDEK. 199

Without Jerusalem, the Jews Have neither Priest nor King
Prophecy Says that the Christian Priesthood Must Replace the Jewish
The Superiority of Priest-King Melchizedek
The Conclusion and Appeal for Action

VIII. CASUALTIES, CHARMS, AND CHAMPIONS 230

The Drunken "Fast" Is Over
We Must Look After Our Casualties
What to Do and Say to the Fallen
The Closing Appeal

TABLE OF SCRIPTURE CITATIONS 269

BIBLIOGRAPHY 281

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

ANF, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*
Arndt and Gingrich, *Greek-English Lexicon*, ed. W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich
Coleman-Norton, Palladius *Dialogue*, ed. P. R. Coleman-Norton
EH, *Ecclesiastical History* (as title for ancient works)
Förster, Libanius *Epistles*, ed. R. Förster
Greek, the text of the Migne ed. of the Sermons *Against the Jews*
HTR, *Harvard Theological Review*
IDB, *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*
JBL, *Journal of Biblical Literature*
JE, *Jewish Encyclopedia*
Lampe, *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, ed. G. W. H. Lampe
LCL, Loeb Classical Library
Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*, ed. H. G. Liddell and R. Scott; new ed. H. S. Jones and R. McKenzie
Montfaucon, Readings from Montfaucon's ed. cited in Migne's text
Morrello, Readings from Morrello's ed. cited in Migne's text
MPG, *Patrologia Graeca*, ed. J. P. Migne
NEB, *New English Bible*
Nestle, *Η Καινη Διαθηκη*, ed. E. Nestle; apparatus G. D. Kilpatrick
NPNF (1), *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 1st Series
NPNF (2), *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 2nd Series
ODC, *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*
P804, MS Nat. Lib. gr. 804, ff. 105-317
Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*, ed. A. Rahlfs
RSV, *Revised Standard Version*
Savile, Readings from Savile's ed. in Migne's text
SDABD, *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Dictionary*
SJE, *Standard Jewish Encyclopedia*
Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon*, ed. E. A. Sophocles
Theodotion, Theodotion's recension of Daniel in Rahlf's LXX
Thomson, *Septuagint Bible*, trans. Charles Thomson, 2nd ed., rev.
TR, Textus Receptus
UJE, *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*
V560, MS Vat. gr. 560, ff. 179-260

PREFACE TO THE TRANSLATION

The Text on Which the Translation Is Based

In the first sentence of the preface to his translation of Ammianus Marcellinus in the Loeb Classical Library, John C. Rolfe reminds his readers that "this is a translation and not a critical edition."[1]

Such a statement is even more true of the translation offered here. Rolfe could go on to say that his version was at least based on a critical text. I cannot.

There is no critical text of Chrysostom's sermons Against the Jews available, just as there is no critical edition available for most of his writings; and it is not likely that one will appear for some time to come.

P. Utto Riedinger OSB has assembled a list of no fewer than one hundred and twenty manuscripts of these sermons, to which Marcel Richard has added two more, to make a total of one hundred and twenty-two.[2] Since the length of this series of sermons is roughly equivalent to one-third of the length of the Greek New Testament, the task involved in producing a critical edition will be considerable.

---

[1] Michael Grant, translator of Tacitus for the Penguin classics ([Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, Inc., 1956], p. 23), says, "It is not part of the translator's task to discuss the text or to offer comments on disputed points." R. F. Weymouth, J. B. Phillips, and the translators of the New English Bible (for bibliography, see below) also eschew the responsibility for establishing a critical text of the Bible before beginning their work. Of course, not all translators agree with this point of view. Witness James Moffatt's many emendations to the Old Testament text.

[2] Personal correspondence from Marcel Richard of the Institut de Recherche et D'Histoire des Textes, Paris, Oct. 19, 1964.

Of these 122 MSS, 1 is from the ninth century and 1 from the ninth to the tenth centuries, 14 are from the tenth century and 5 from the tenth to the eleventh centuries, 40 are from the eleventh century and 4 from the eleventh to the twelfth, 21 are from the twelfth century, 15 are from the thirteenth to the fifteenth or early sixteenth centuries, 7 are from the sixteenth, 2 from the seventeenth, and 1 from the eighteenth century. Of the total number, 11 have not been dated.

Five editions of these sermons have been published in all. In 1914 L. Canet traced their history in an article in which he reports work he had been doing himself towards the production of a modern edition.[1]

The editio princeps was issued by David Hoeschel in Augsburg in 1602 and was based on a Codex Cyprius, now lost, but emended according to two other MSS,[2] Mon. grec. 354 and Vat. Pal. gr. 15, both of the eleventh century. In 1609 Fronton du Duc published an edition in Paris based on Hoeschel's but revised according to the readings which Hoeschel had placed in his margin and appendix. In 1612 Savile published at Eton an edition which was also based on Hoeschel's but which contained marginal readings from three Oxford MSS, particularly from the eleventh-century MS, Auct. E.1.13. In

---

[1] L. Canet, "Pour l'edition de S. Jean Chrysostome Adversus Judaeos," Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'Ecole Française de Rome, XXXIV (1914), 97-200.

[2] Mon. gr. 354 and Vat. Pal. gr. 15.

1718, a century later, Montfaucon produced an edition in Paris which was essentially Fronton du Duc's but which contained in the margin references to Savile's edition and notices about variants from fourteen MSS in the French Royal Library (at least eight of which were from the eleventh century). Another century or so later, Th. Fix made some slight further revisions of Montfaucon according to the edition of Savile, and it was this slightly altered Montfaucon which Migne printed in 1862.

Thus, says Canet, the Migne edition is essentially the Codex Cyprius used by Hoeschel, revised rather sparingly over the years against some nineteen MSS.

As for himself, Canet laid the groundwork for a modern critical edition by analyzing a selected portion[1] of Sermon v as he found it in forty-nine MSS, on the basis of which he set up two main classes of MSS, A and B, and thirteen sub-classes. He assigned 16 MSS to class A, and 33 to class B.

While Canet's work will undoubtedly prove of much value to anyone who ultimately may prepare a critical text, the fact that today 122 MSS are known in comparison to the 49 which he analyzed, emphasizes how much work yet remains to be done.

Opinion about the relative value of each of the available printed texts varies with the observer. The article "Chrysostom" in the 1958 Encyclopaedia Britannica says that of Chrysostom's works "the best edition is that of Migne." On the other hand, the article "John Chrysostom" by C. Baur in the Catholic Encyclopedia (1910), says that "the best text" is Savile's, and the *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (Articles "Henry Savile" and "St. John Chrysostom") refers to Savile's "celebrated" work as "still the best edition of the text." But although Philip Schaff, in his Prolegomena to the translation of Chrysostom in the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*,[1] says that Savile "gives a more correct Greek text" than Montfaucon, on the same page he says that Montfaucon's is "the best edition." Likewise, the *ODC* (Article "Montfaucon") calls Montfaucon's a "splendid" edition, and Sr. Thomas Aquinas Goggin, for her 1957-60 translation of Chrysostom's *Commentary on St. John* in the *Fathers of the Church* series, explains that "in the absence of an adequate critical edition, the text used for the present translation is the Benedictine edition of Bernard de Montfaucon."

---

[1] MPG, vol. XLVII, col. 898, line 3, to col. 899, line 39.

The disagreement arises from the fact that there is no definitive edition yet available. As Johannes Quasten[2] says, a "genuinely critical edition" of Chrysostom's works "is badly needed." Besides the "astonishing" host of Greek MSS available, there is a great number of translations for many of his writings, the oldest of which are in Latin, Syriac, and Armenian. But so far off is any hope of the achievement of a critical text, that as yet, he says, "no satisfactory survey," even, "of the Greek manuscripts exists and the value of the different versions has yet to be established."

The present translation is based on the edition in Migne, for the following reasons:

---

[1] Second series, IX, 3.

[2] *Patrology* (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1960-62), III, 430.

1. Migne's is the most readily available edition, both to me and to others who may wish to check my translation.

2. There seems to be no clear reason to prefer any other edition.

3. If, to Canet's mind, the Migne edition is not, technically speaking, "based on" more than one MS, it has at least been influenced by more manuscripts than any other edition. In the course of its development it has been collated against nineteen different MSS as well as, in turn, all the previous editions.

4. It contains several hundred footnotes referring to variant readings in the MSS and in the other editions.

5. Very few of the variants noted seem to change the essential burden of the sermons anyway.

6. According to C. Baur, it contains very few printer's errors.[1]

The absence of a critical edition may not be such a formidable handicap after all. Against the Migne edition I have collated the tenth-century MS Vat. gr. 560 and the eleventh-century MS Paris Nat. Lib. gr. 804,[2] neither of which has been used in any existing printed text. Migne has taken cognizance of twenty MSS, and in these two additional MSS which I collated I have found but few variants of any consequence which are not already recorded in Migne's footnotes.

---

[1] Canet, _op_. _cit_., p. 98, n. 1. I have found only a few myself.

[2] For the folio numbers, see note 1, p. x. Canet places both of these MSS in his larger class, class B, but in two separate subclasses. The large number of similar variants which I have found seems to justify his placing them both in the same major class, and the many divergent readings justify their going into different subclasses while at the same time also removing any possibility that one of them could have been copied directly from the other.

Sermons ii and iii are missing from many manuscripts, and an indeterminate section--perhaps a half--is missing from Sermon ii even in those manuscripts which, containing that sermon, were used for the Migne edition. I procured a total of ten MSS dating from the ninth to the eleventh centuries and stored in such widely scattered libraries as those in Oxford, Paris, Rome, Athens, Jerusalem, and at Mt. Sinai, but neither age nor widely scattered origin was able to make one of them contain even a portion of Sermon ii, let alone its missing portion.[1] Only one of these MSS, Auct. E.1.13 of the Bodleian library, has been used anywhere along the line in the preparation of the printed editions. This particular one from Oxford was Savile's favorite, according to Canet, yet it, like the one I procured from Mount Sinai, omitted not only Sermons ii and iii but also Sermon i, calling Sermon iv Λόγος α΄.

The study of these MSS has been valuable to me as a means of visualizing the textual problems involved, but the preparation of a critical text must be undertaken before many of these variants--there are approximately 2200 in the two MSS alone--can be properly evaluated. Such limited collation as has been practicable for me can only serve to accumulate footnotes on the basis of "here they are for what they're worth."

---

[1] These manuscripts are:
(1) Oxford: Bod. Lib., MS Auct. E.1.13, ff. 353-426, eleventh century.
(2) Oxford: Bod. Lib., MS Cromwell 20, ff. 111-229, eleventh century.
(3) Paris: Cois., gr. 246, ff. 80-188, tenth century.
(4) Paris: Nat. Lib., gr. 804, ff. 105-317, eleventh century.
(5) Vatican: Vat. gr. 560, ff. 179-260, tenth century.
(6) Vatican: Vat. gr. 1526, ff. 142-207, tenth century.
(7) Vatican: Vat. gr. 575, ff. 1-104, eleventh century.
(8) Athens: Nat. Lib., 265, ff. 68-155, tenth century.
(9) Jerusalem: Pat. Lib., S. Sabas 36, ff. 108-203, tenth-eleventh centuries.
(10) Mount Sinai: Mon. Lib., gr. 375, ff. 276-352, ninth-tenth centuries.

All the variants in Migne's footnotes which affect the English translation are noted in the footnotes to my translation, along with a statement, in many cases, as to whether either or both of the MSS which I collated support or fail to support each one.

Even though this is "a translation and not a critical text," it may prove to be of value in the development of a critical text, since an editor must sooner or later determine what his author is trying to say, and this translation will, hopefully, contribute toward such an understanding.

Principles and Practices of Translation

The basic decision every translator must make is whether to provide a literal version or a paraphrase--or, rather, toward what balance between rigidity and freedom he should set his sights. One extreme, of course, produces "the hand-shoes, which on the table were, have I in the pocket put." In 1876 a certain Julia Smith actually made such a translation of the Bible, and under her hand Jeremiah 22:23 appeared as, "Thou dwelling in Lebanon, building a nest in the cedars, how being compassionated in pangs coming to thee the pain as of her bringing forth."[1] Interlinearies are of this caliber. They make good ponies but they are not translations.

---

[1] Quoted in E. H. Robertson, The New Translations of the Bible (G. W. H. Lampe and David M. Paton [eds.], "Studies in Ministry and Worship"; London: S. C. M. Press, Ltd., 1959), p. 49.

At the other end of the spectrum is the extremely free translation which attempts to make the author sound as though he were a native both to the language of the translation and to the culture of the people for whom the version is intended. J. B. Phillips, for example, renders Romans 16:16 not as, "Salute one another with an holy kiss" (KJV), but as, "Give one another a hearty handshake all round."[1]

Throughout the history of translation, different schools of translation have taken different positions on the long continuum between the two poles. In 1940, for example, C. J. Cadoux observed that the Oxford method of translating aimed to convey the sense of the original document through a free idiomatic English without paying too much attention to its precise words, their order, part of speech, and so on, but that the Cambridge method was to pay "meticulous attention to verbal accuracy," translating as literally as it was possible to do without effecting positive violence to English usage, or positively misrepresenting the author's meaning, and then "to leave it to the reader to discern the sense as well as he can from the content!"[2]

---

[1] J. B. Phillips, The New Testament in Modern English (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1961). Phillips' translation of Acts 8:20, "To hell with you and your money!" and his rather lame defense, "These words are exactly what the Greek means. It is a pity that their real meaning is obscured by modern slang usage," shows how an idomatic translation can defeat itself on occasion.

[2] C. J. Cadoux, in an essay in H. Wheeler Robinson (ed.), The Bible in Its Ancient and English Versions (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940), p. 251. Quoted in Robertson, op. cit., p. 37.

Fortunately, in recent years a large number of books and articles have appeared analyzing scientifically the problems involved, and much of this work has been absorbed into a new book, Toward a Science of Translating, by the dean of contemporary translators, Eugene A. Nida.[1]

Nida recognizes at the outset the basic tension between literal and paraphrase, "form and meaning," "the letter and the spirit," and asks, "Is translating an art or a science?"[2] The answer which he provides shows that good translating is both an art and a science.

Nida refers to literal translating as "formal-equivalence (D-E) translation."[3] "Formal equivalence," he says in defining his terms, "focusses attention on the message itself, in both form and content. In such a translation one is concerned with such correspondences as poetry to poetry, sentence to sentence, and concept to concept," and with attempts to reproduce nouns with nouns and verbs with verbs, and with preserving precise sentence structure and punctuation. On the other hand, "a translation of dynamic equivalence aims at complete naturalness of expression, and tries to relate the receptor to modes of behaviour relevant within the context of his own culture," a technique particularly exemplified by the Phillips version of the New Testament.[4]

---

[1] Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964. Nida makes no apology for relating much--though by no means all--of his book to the translation of the Bible, since, as he says (pp. 4-5), no book surpasses the Bible in range of subject matter, linguistic variety (from Greek, Hebrew, and Aramaic into 1200 languages and dialects), historical depth, cultural diversity, number of translators involved, and accumulation of data.

[2] Ibid., pp. 2-3.

[3] Ibid., pp. 159 ff.

[4] Ibid., pp. 159-60, 165.

Nida devotes a chapter to the history of translating and traces the swinging of the pendulum of preference back and forth between the two schools of thought. In the nineteenth century there was a reaction current in favor of formal equivalence, and it was under its influence that the Revised Version of the Bible (1881-85) was produced--"perhaps," he comments grimly, "the best illustration of the pernicious effects of a literalistic view of translation."[1] Today, however, the pendulum is swinging back the other way. Nida says:

> Between the two poles of translating (i.e. between strict formal equivalence and complete dynamic equivalence), there are a number of intervening grades, representing various acceptable standards of literary translating. During the past fifty years, however, there has been a marked shift of emphasis from the formal to the dynamic dimension. A recent summary of opinion on translating by literary artists, publishers, educators, and professional translators indicates clearly that the present direction is toward increasing emphasis on dynamic equivalence.[2]

"It seems to be increasingly recognized," he goes on, "that adherence to the letter may indeed kill the spirit."[3]

Nida tabulates four basic requirements of a good translation, namely those of "(1) making sense, (2) conveying the spirit and manner of the original, (3) having a natural and easy form of expression, and (4) producing a similar response [to that produced by the original]."[4] In achieving these ends, he says,--paradoxical as it may seem,--"mistakes in D-E translations are generally less numerous, for they are usually made with the translator's eyes wide open,"[5] and "in practice F-E translations tend to distort the message more than D-E translations."[1]

---

[1] _Ibid._, p. 20.

[2] _Ibid._, p. 160, citing Edmond Cary (ed.), "Notre Enquete," _Babel_, V, 61-106.

[3] _Ibid._, p. 161. [4] _Ibid._, p. 164. [5] _Ibid._, p. 184.

Of course, he does not call for extreme dynamic equivalence--nor yet for some mechanically determined half-way point between it and formal equivalence. "The fact . . . that the extremes of F-E and D-E translating skew the message does not mean that the best translation is necessarily at a half-way point between the two extremes. Actually there is a relatively wide band in F-E and D-E translations in which the formal differences in and of themselves do not necessarily distort the message."[2]

Nida warns that although "numerous minor alterations in form must be made, . . . radical changes are not to be made merely for the sake of editorial improvement or at the translator's whim or fancy";[3] and since in the process of translation a good deal of the sparkle and luster of the original language is likely to be lost,--Goodspeed labored under the conviction that any translation of a masterpiece was foredoomed to be a failure,[4]--"accordingly, if a translation is to be anything but a pale reflection of a brilliant original, it must have certain compensating correspondences which reflect a dynamic concept of translating."[5]

Then in a chapter on "The Role of the Translator,"[6] Nida stresses the need of the translator to understand not only the obvious content of the message he is translating, but also the subtleties of its meaning, its "flavor and feel"; he should have a thorough acquaintance with the subject matter concerned; he should have a "truly empathetic spirit" for the material, and if not the same talent, at least the same kind of talent, as the author he chooses. He will inevitably leave some of the stamp of his own personality on any translation he makes, but he should exert every effort to reduce the intrusion of himself to a minimum. At the same time, "no translator can escape being colored by his own time, and it is wrong to try too hard to cut free from this influence."[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 192.

[2] Ibid., p. 191.

[3] Edgar J. Goodspeed, The New Testament, An American Translation (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1923), p. vii.

[4] Nida, op. cit., p. 225.

[5] Ibid., beginning on p. 145.

The translator should work, not by words and punctuation marks, but by "meaningful mouthfuls,"[2] and, finally, he must recognize that the translator's lot has traditionally been one of "little thanks, poor pay, and plenty of abuse."[3]

Turning from Nida for a few moments to the considered opinions and advice of others, it is important to recognize the value they place on a smooth, clear, and pleasant style. For example, Dr. Johnson is said to have observed that the first excellence of a translator lies in producing pages "such as may be read with pleasure by those who do not know the original."[4] Michael Grant says the same thing in a different way. Confronted with the difficulty of translating Tacitus into English he complains,

---

[1] The portion of this sentence that is in quotation marks is quoted by Nida (op. cit., p. 148) from Richard Lattimore, "Practical Notes on Translating Greek Poetry," in R. A. Brower (ed.), On Translation (Cambridge: The Harvard University Press, 1959), p. 54.

[2] Ibid., p. 147.

[3] Ibid., p. 145.

[4] Quoted by James Moffatt, A New Translation of the Bible (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1934), p. vii.

> Any attempt to render Tacitus' peculiar Latin into peculiar English would mean abysmal failure in another most peremptory requirement. For, in our mid-twentieth century, it would not be readable--and, except as a mere crib, an unreadable translation is useless.[1]

Edgar J. Goodspeed, for so many years an outstanding name at the University of Chicago, reduced the problem of translating the New Testament to two basic steps:

> The translation of such a book demands first, the understanding of what the several writers meant to say, the second, the casting of their thought in the simplest and clearest of present-day English.[2]

J. B. Phillips, perhaps the best-known translator in the English-speaking world today, sets up three tests for a successful translation:

> The first is simply that it must not sound like a translation at all. If it is skillfully done, and we are not previously informed, we should be quite unaware that it *is* a translation. . . . [The second test is] that a translator does his work with the least possible obtrusion of his own personality. The third and final test which a good translator should be able to pass is that of being able to produce in the hearts and minds of his readers an effect equivalent to that produced by the author upon his original readers.[3]

Phillips' third test, that of "equivalent effect," is, of course, similar to Eugene Nida's "dynamic equivalence." E. V. Rieu, a successful and lucid translator of Homer, says that for himself this principle of equivalent effect is "the lodestar of the translator's art" and goes on to show how ridiculous it would be to translate literally, rather than dynamically, the French term of endearment, mon chou ("my cabbage")![1] It is not surprising, then, that Rieu defends a legitimate use of paraphrase:

---

[1] Grant, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

[2] Goodspeed, *op. cit.*, p. v.

[3] Phillips, *op. cit.*, p. vii.

> The word [paraphrase] is often used as a term of abuse for very good translation. I should put it this way, that it is permissible only where literal translation is liable to obscure the original meaning. I would go further and say that on such occasions it is not only permissible, but it is imperative and therefore it becomes good translation, and the word 'paraphrase' should disappear.[2]

A skillful and adequate quest for "equivalent effect" is by no means less difficult than the production of a formal and literal translation, but much more so. R. F. Weymouth once huffed that "an utterly ignorant or utterly lazy man, if possessed of a little ingenuity, can with the help of a dictionary and grammar give a word-for-word rendering, whether intelligible or not, and print 'Translation' on the title page."[3] E. V. Rieu pointed out that "if you're going to apply the principle of equivalent effect, you've got to examine very carefully the style, the spirit, and the meaning of your original";[4] and once you have done that and start to put what you have found into clear English--Dr. Goodspeed says, "it is often assumed that the familiar style, the style of modern speech, is an easy, careless style to write. Quite the opposite. . . . It is simple enough to write the stiff formal style of the old translators, but it is far more taxing to write in the familiar spoken English of today."[1]

---

[1] From a statement by E. V. Rieu on a BBC broadcast, Dec. 3, 1963, quoted by Robertson, op. cit., p. 123.

[2] From the same broadcast as referred to in n. 1, above, and quoted in Robertson, op. cit., pp. 128-29.

[3] From the preface to the first edition, The New Testament in Modern Speech (New York: Harper & Brothers, Pubs., n.d.), p. x.

[4] BBC Broadcast, Dec. 3, 1953; quoted by Robertson, op. cit., p. 125.

Which leads us, in concluding this section, to a point where all successful translators of ancient documents seem to agree; namely, that translating is hard work. "Only those who have made the attempt," says Moffatt, "know how hard it is to translate . . . adequately."[2] "I soon learned," recalls Goodspeed, "that [what I wrote] after I had done fifteen or sixteen verses . . . had lost its edge and quality."[3] "The proper rendering of a single verse . . . may take hours of reading and thought," says J. B. Phillips.[4] And Luther reports, "Such was our labor while translating Job that Master Philip, Aurogallus, and I could at times scarcely finish three lines in four days," so that Job seemed determined to sit on his dunghill forever! Even when confronted with the less difficult New Testament, Luther sighs, "Translating has been good for me; otherwise I might have died in the mistaken notion that I was a learned fellow."[5]

And predictably so, if Nida's judgment is to be trusted. Viewing the total concept of translation all around the world, Nida approvingly quotes a statement by I. A. Richards, who concludes that

---

[1] Edgar J. Goodspeed, As I Remember (New York: Harper & Brothers, Pubs., 1953), p. 163.

[2] Op. cit., pp. vii-viii.

[3] As I Remember, pp. 162-63.

[4] Four Prophets (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1963), p. xv.

[5] Of these three items from Luther, the first is from his Open Letter on Translating (1530), the second is from a letter to Spalatin, Feb. 23, 1524, and the third is from a letter to Hartmut von Cronberg, March, 1522; all reproduced in Ewald M. Plass (ed.), What Luther Says (St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia Publishing House, 1959), I, 106, 105.

> [in translating] we have . . . indeed what may very probably be the most complex type of event yet produced in the evolution of the cosmos.[1]

Guidelines for This Present Translation

Now to apply all this παραίνεσις καὶ συμβουλή, as Chrysostom would put it, to these sermons *Against the Jews*, or rather, these "sermons against the Judaizers."[2]

1. In choosing between a literal and "dynamically equivalent" translation, it is at once clear that a literal version will not do. The word order and syntax of the homilies are so complex that a literal translation would be no translation.

But to produce a version which would sound as though Chrysostom were a twentieth-century American, is equally out of place. No man of his talent and position would even preach these sermons today. To translate them "from culture to culture" would require substituting a different theme for his anti-Judaism and recasting his sermons after the model, perhaps, of a Harry Emmerson Fosdick fighting Fundamentalism, or of a Billy Graham crusading against sin. But this would not provide much information as to what Chrysostom actually said!

Yet sermons by a speaker of Chrysostom's skill demand due attention to formal equivalence--much more so than some of the relatively "formless" passages in the epistles of Paul. And as for dynamic equivalence, it is evident that any fair translation must convey something of the excitement of his scathing rebukes and spirited appeals. Never did Charles G. Finney more earnestly "preach for a verdict." Chrysostom was vigorous, alert, vital, contemporary, relevant. These sermons seethe with emotion. Sentence after sentence is tense as a wound-up ballista.

---

[1] Nida, *op. cit.*, p. 10, quoting I. A. Richards, "Toward a Theory of Translating," in Arthur F. Wright (ed.), *Studies in Chinese Thought* (American Anthropology Assoc., Vol. LV, Memoir 75; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1953), p. 250.

[2] Cf. Marcel Simon, *Verus Israel* (2nd ed.; Paris: Editions E. de Boccard, 1964), p. 175: "C'est aux chretiens judaisants d' Antioche quils s'adressent." But this is obvious from their content.

Chrysostomus Baur OSB,[1] after a lifetime's devotion to his patron saint, speaks of the "inexpressible sweetness" which pours from Chrysostom's sermons; and through his American translator, M. Gonzaga, has provided extensive selections in English which manifest a truly beautiful flow of words and of gentle, gracious kindliness which bears out Baur's insistence that "as a rule his language showed the aristocratic elegance of the well-educated Greek and the heart-warming tone of a noble character."[2] His was an elegance which made no attempt at the brilliance of mere formal rhetoric, because the message was always the thing.

Yet even Baur admits that Chrysostom "was occasionally sharp and severe in his expressions, and in exceptional cases came near the limit of good taste."[3] Specifically in reference to the homilies against the Jews, Baur concedes their "shrill tone" and the amazement which Jews might well have shown at Chrysostom's "conception of mildness." He admits that in this instance the Antiochenes bestowed enthusiastic applause on material "for which Chrysostom today would probably be brought before a public prosecutor."[4]

---

[1] John Chrysostom and His Time, trans. M. Gonzaga RSM (2 vols.: Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1959).

[2] Ibid., p. 224.

[3] Idem.

[4] Ibid., pp. 333, 335.

Others have noted his sharpness with less reticence. Quasten[1] says that "his fiery temperament betrayed him only too often into inconsiderate, if not offensive, speech," and Marcel Simon[2] finds the homilies Against the Jews replete with violent and passionate anti-Semitism. Far from being a gentle Christian saint, to J. B. Bury[3] Chrysostom was a "rough and uncourtly monk."

If then, my translation of these sermons seems strangely strident in comparison with available translations of his other sermons, there is a reason.

2. In translating "good Greek into good English" I have tried to remember that these sermons were not preached primarily to scholars but to "weary, worn-out male and female slaves, workmen, and servants, . . . [to] theatrical and circus people, small tradesmen and hand workers, soldiers, sailors and . . . officials," as well, of course, as to a few "rhetoricians and professors," some "wealthy merchants" and an occasional visiting bishop.[4]

3. Since footnotes call attention to a large number of my departures from literal translation, only a few specific items need explaining here.

a. The Greek ejaculation μὴ γένοιτο is translated in the KJV uniformly as "God forbid," and in the RSV almost uniformly as "by no means." The NEB shows more variety in its treatment of the term and

---

[1] Op. cit., p. 425. [2] Op. cit., p. 262.

[3] History of the Later Roman Empire (1st ed.; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1958), I, 138-42.

[4] Baur, op. cit., p. 207. Analyses of Chrysostom's style include M. A. Burns, Saint John Chrysostom's Homilies on the Statues: A Study of Their Rhetorical Qualities and Form ("Catholic University

Phillips goes so far as to render it (once), "What a ghastly thought!"[1] I have used whatever strong expression seems to fit the context best; sometimes "God forbid!", sometimes "not at all" or "but surely not," and once I translated the sentence ἀλλὰ μ. γ. τοῦτο ἐπεῖν as "Perish the thought!"[2]

b. The verb φιλονικέω, or one of its derivatives, appears so frequently in these sermons, either alone or in combination with some form of ἄκαιρος, that the best practice might have been to translate with a uniform word or phrase after the manner of the concordant versions of the Bible. But "to be contentious," is not very current English, and "untimely contention" is definitely quaint. Depending on the context I have used "obstinately," "disagreeably argumentative," "contentious," "outmoded opinion," and so on.

c. These sermons almost never use the name "Jesus." They occasionally refer to "the Lord," but their most common designation for the founder of Christianity is "Christ." I have translated Χριστός uniformly as "Christ" and have never used "Jesus" for variety.

d. Chrysostom rarely refers to the Jews as "Jews," seeming to prefer to use a personal or demonstrative pronoun. I have substituted the noun occasionally to avoid ambiguity, just as I have substituted nouns in quite a number of other cases for the same reason.

---

of America Patristic Studies," No. XXII; Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 1930), and F. W. A. Dickinson, *The Use of the Optative Mood in the Works of St. John Chrysostom* ("Catholic University of America Patristic Studies," No. XI; Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 1926).

[1] Romans 6:2.

[2] Col. 847:26-27.

e. In especially excited passages I have let Chrysostom use abbreviated forms like "don't," "isn't," and "wouldn't." I notice that some modern ministers whose sermons are printed in the current volume of Best Sermons[1] use such forms in appropriate places.

f. I have usually translated δοῦλος and δεσπότης as "servant" and "lord" respectively, rather than as "slave" and "master." My reason is that in modern America "slave" usually connotes a downtrodden Negro bondsman and "master" a Simon Legree--or, it may be, an expert musician or artist. Slavery in Antioch in the fourth century was something different from what it was in the American South. Goodspeed's New Testament appears to translate δοῦλος as "slave" uniformly, but the RSV, NEB, and Phillips use either servant or slave as various contexts seem to require.[2] But perhaps the words should be rendered "slave" and "master" uniformly in these sermons.

g. In translating quotations from the Bible I have chosen to render them as closely as possible to the RSV. My reason is that the RSV is conservative, authorized, and relatively literal and hence may strike the ear today somewhat in the same way as the Greek Bible did in the fourth century. Where Chrysostom's Greek has departed from Nestle's New Testament text[3] enough to affect the translation, I have altered the RSV to show this departure. In the case of Old Testament passages I have followed the RSV where it was close enough. A few times I have given Thomson's translation of the Septuagint,[1] but often I have made my own translation of Old Testament passages after checking these versions. I have also made my own translation of a few New Testament passages where the RSV does not seem to provide the thought which Chrysostom draws from the verse. I have capitalized pronouns referring to deity, even when otherwise following the RSV precisely, for the arbitrary reason that I think Chrysostom would have had it so. It is noteworthy that Chrysostom often follows Theodotion when quoting Daniel, but gives some very interesting variants.[2]

---

[1] Protestant Edition, ed. G. Paul Butler (Princeton, N. J.: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1964), vol. IX.

[2] Based on an examination of ten examples in each of the named versions.

[3] That is, the second edition of the British and Foreign Bible Society's text prepared by Erwin Nestle with apparatus by G. D. Kilpatrick, London, 1958.

It should be observed carefully that all ellipses indicated in Scripture passages are elipses made by Chrysostom himself and not by the translator.

h. In the footnotes I have given all titles of ancient works in English. There seems to be no consistency on this point in modern authors. Along with "Plato _Laws_" and "Procopius _Wars_," one may find in the same book "Chrysostom _Hom_. 6 _in_ _Matt_." Because I have undertaken to provide an English translation of an ancient work, I have preferred to be consistent and, along with other Englished titles, cited "Sermon vi _On_ _Matthew_."

i. I have supplied each sermon with a title of my own devising, and I defend myself on the "culture to culture" basis. Published sermons in America today almost always carry titles, often catchy ones.

The section divisions in the Greek text seem to be based on a

---

[1] Charles Thomson (trans.), _The Septuagint Bible_ (2nd ed., rev. C. A. Muses; Indian Hills, Colo.: The Falcon's Wing Press, 1960.

[2] See, for example, p. 139.

(useful) desire to keep the sections all more or less equal in length, that is, between one and a half and two and a half columns long. I have placed the section numbers in the margin and made my own divisions and subheadings according to logical divisions of thought.

4. As for that "truly empathetic spirit" which Nida says a translator should feel for his author, I can hardly claim such sympathy with Chrysostom's harshness against the Jews. As a "man of the cloth" myself, however, I greatly admire, and I think I understand, his intense concern for the salvation of his flock. Indeed, it is this very concern which, while it provided a misguided impetus for these sermons, also redeems them.

5. My personal motive in undertaking this translation has been to learn more about Greek and the translation thereof and more about early Jewish-Christian relations at a time, today, when such matters have received special stimulation by the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. As the task has progressed I have also come to hope that, in this day when Christian leaders, at the Vatican and elsewhere, are rethinking their traditional attitude towards the people of Israel, the bald bigotry of these sermons, if made more generally available, might play some small part in directing Christian thought along more worthy lines.

Other Translations

Apart from translations which may have been made anciently into such languages as Syriac and Armenian, complete versions of the Sermons *Against the Jews* have heretofore been available only in Latin and French.

The introduction to these sermons in Migne provides the information that

> David Hoeschel did the Latin translation of the first homily, Fronto Ducaeus of the second and third, and Erasmus of the five latter ones, to which translations we have made some emendations after checking with the Greek MSS.[1]

In French, three versions are available. Jeannin, Joly, and Bareille[2] each produced a full set of Chrysostom's Works in French between the years 1863 and 1872. Each of these contains a translation of the Sermons Against the Jews. Unfortunately, although I ordered a microfilm of Bareille's version, it was delayed for many months and did not arrive in time to be of assistance in this present project.

The only English version of an extended portion of any one of these sermons, according to the catalogue of the British Museum,[3] is a portion of Sermon viii--though it purports to be a portion of Sermon i--published in London in 1574 in a curious little pamphlet titled The Disclosing of a Late Counterfeyted Possession by the Devyl in Two Maydens within the Citie of London.

Two women, Rachel Pynder (also spelled Pindar and Pinder) and Agnes Brigges had been exorcised and had then confessed their "counterfeitinges" at Paules Cross. The exact words of the exorcist are given, together with Sathan's replies, followed by the women's confessions, verbatim, and then by a short section of appropriate quotations from Leviticus, Deuteronomy, and Jesus the son of Sirach. At the close of the work

---

[1] MPG, vol. XLVIII, col. 842.

[2] Listed in the catalogue of the Bibliothèque Nationale under the numbers C 2225, C 2228, and C 4761 respectively.

[3] Catalogue number C.27.al.

> there is added a part of an Homilie, written by that learned man Iohn Chrisostome, sometime Archebishop of Constantinople, whiche maye sufficiently instructe us all to beware, not onely of Witchecraftes, but also inveieth specially againste Iewes and witches, whiche seeme to doo good, and to heale suche as be hurt by others.[1]

The selection itself is introduced under the heading,

> In the first Homelie agaynst the Iewes, by Iohn Chrysostome, sometyme Archbishop of Constantinople.

Here is the first of twenty-two pages worth, together with my translation as found on pp. 246-49, below.

Seyng the fame of the people doth incoure us eyther to alow or disalow those thinges which we heare reported, my counsell is, that we do favour and extoll all such reports, as any ways may advance our christian religion, and not to set out with our talkinges those things that doe hinder our profession, or are a shame to us Christians: but as much as may lye in us, to hide them with silence, to thende that we maye avoyde them.	A rumor many times has the power both to destroy and to establish a soul; it can create enthusiasm where none exists, and destroy it where it does. This is why I counsel you to strengthen those reports which exalt our side and make it seem great, and not to exalt those which bring disgrace on the community of brothers. If we hear something good, let us pass it on to everyone; but if we hear something detrimental and bad, let us keep the report to ourselves and do everything we can to remove the basis for it.
Therefore counsell thou the sicke partie manfullye to suffer corporall paynes, to thende that he might obey Christ, and not to gad to Witches, or to counsell with wyse women (as they be called), which are Christes mortall enimyes.	[Cf. pp. 246-49, which nowhere mentions wise women.]
If the sick partie by way of excuse will say, I seek to be holpen of my sickenesse and infirmitie of this good woman, (etc.).	If he brings up certain services and says to you, "They promised to heal me," (etc.).

Even if the creator of this vigorous paraphrase had Englished the entire series, there would still have been a place for a new version made on modern principles!

Acknowledgments

I acknowledge with particular gratitude the splendid generosity of my wife's father and mother, Mr. and Mrs. Reuben B. Weitz of Lodi, California, which made possible my years in residence at the University of Chicago; and the special grants voted me by the Board of Union College, Lincoln, Nebraska, which provided additional time for the completion of my doctoral program.

Professor Robert M. Grant's amazing command of detail and friendly sense of humor have been to me respectively both inspiration and balm since the inauguration of my studies at the Great Gray University on the Midway, and Professor Benedict Einarson's control of Greek--a competence exceeding even his unfailing patience--has made the writing of this thesis a truly rewarding fellowship.

Simon Cohen, Reference Librarian at Hebrew Union College, provided me with Julian dates for Nisan 15 in the latter years of the fourth century. Gilberte Morize and Marcel Richard of the Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes assisted in the location of manuscripts. Raymond Hohlfeld MM made me a private translation of Montfaucon's Latin introduction to the Sermons Against the Jews, and my senior colleague at Union, Hollis Reinmuth, extended me a similar courtesy in connection with several pages of unusually technical German. Glanville Downey, Johannes Quasten, E. E. Malone OSB, and Conrad Falk OSB replied helpfully to correspondence addressed to them. Fritz Guy, Larry Eldridge, John Staples, and my brothers, Lawrence and Malcolm Maxwell, assisted in the location of library materials when needed. An attorney friend, a physician, a saloon keeper, and a farmer's wife assisted in my search for English equivalents.

Lola Schermerhorn typed the final draught, with grace and efficiency. Frank Diehl and Pat Colvin "ran it off."

And my little wife, Pauline, shared the joys and vicissitudes of these many years with an unruffled spirit and right gallant good will.

To all of these, and to many others, I express herewith my sincerest thanks.

INTRODUCTION

The Man and the Times

Chrysostom's career.--John Chrysostom quite probably was still in his thirties when he preached these vigorous sermons *Against the Jews*. Born apparently in 354[1] the son of Secundus,[2] a high-ranking army officer who died shortly afterwards, he was brought up by his Christian mother, Anthusa,[3] who, though widowed around the age of twenty, commanded sufficient means to hire servants and to provide John with an education[4] in rhetoric under Libanius, the outstanding pagan orator of the day, and in philosophy under Andragathius,[5] about whom nothing further is known.

At eighteen John was baptized by Meletius[6] and at twenty-one (c. AD 375), became a lector.[7] Along with Theodore, who later became

---

[1] Baur, *op. cit.*, I, 3, following the chronology in Palladius *Dialogue on the Life of St. John Chrysostom*. Baur discusses the dates 344 and 347 set for Chrysostom's birth by various modern authors and rejects them. The *ODC* (article "St. John Chrysostom") gives 347, a date which still places him in his thirties in 386, when this series begins. The dates 344 and 347 have the disadvantage of leaving many years of his life prior to the beginning of his active preaching career inadequately accounted for.

[2] Socrates *EH* vi. 3.

[3] Socrates *loc. cit.*

[4] Chrysostom *On the Priesthood* i. 2. 13-14.

[5] Socrates *loc. cit.*; Baur, *op. cit.*, I, 22-26.

[6] Palladius *op. cit.* i. 1; Baur, *op. cit.*, I, 79-86.

[7] Baur, *op. cit.*, I, 98.

6

Bishop of Mopsuestia, he studied theology for the next four years under Diodorus, who later became Bishop of Tarsus, and Flavian, who later became Bishop of Antioch; then, after yielding temporarily to his mother's tearful plea not to "make me a widow twice,"[1] he left home for a life of monastic contemplation.

Chrysostom threw himself into the arms of asceticism not wisely but too well. He sat up every night for two years in an attempt to keep himself from falling asleep, and then crept back into the city in the winter of 280-81,[2] his body wracked with pain, his health irredeemably damaged, and his kidneys and digestive organs impaired for life.[3]

Yet his monastic experience, if costly, was not in vain. He used the time to master the Scriptures,[4] and his knowledge of the Bible had an enduring and vital effect on all his subsequent preaching. Bible references and allusions poured into his discourses like rain, so that his extant sermons, which are mostly expository, contain between twenty-five and thirty such citations apiece on the average.[5] His eight sermons *Against the Jews* average around thirty-eight biblical citations and allusions each, some of them lengthy passages analyzed in detail. Sermon i contains about sixty direct uses of Scripture.

---

[1] *On the Priesthood* i. 5.

[2] Baur, *op. cit.*, I, 138.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 136, following Palladius *op. cit.* v. Cf. also Chrysostom's references to his health in his letters to Olympias.

[4] Baur (*loc. cit.*), translating Palladius *loc. cit.*, thinks he memorized the New Testament by heart. Herbert Moore ([trans.], *The Dialogue of Palladius Concerning the Life of Chrysostom* [W. J. S. Simpson and W. K. L. Clarke (eds.), "Translations of Christian Literature," Ser. I, Greek Texts; London: S. P. C. K., 1921], p. 39) renders the same passage, "He studied the covenants of Christ." The Greek is ἐκμανθάνων τὰς τοῦ χριστοῦ διαθήκας. *MPG* (vol. XLVII, col. 18) equals Coleman-Norton.

[5] Baur, *op. cit.*, I, 316, "His treatises and approximately six hundred sermons contain not less than eighteen thousand Scripture citations."

Having relinquished a life of solitude Chrysostom was swept into a career of public service that carried him in due course to Constantinople, the archbishopric, exile, and immortal fame. For the present, as soon as his constitution was equal to it, young John was ordained a deacon by his bishop, Meletius, prior to that good man's departure for the Council of Constantinople (381) where he was to meet his death.[1] Five years in the diaconate brought countless duties connected with the host of indigent and infirm on the church's rolls, cares compounded by an embarrassing plethora of church properties to be administered and by recurrent periods of devastating famine, yet affording a man of Chrysostom's industry and eloquence opportunity for the production of articles, pamphlets, and sermons.[2]

In 386 came ordination to the priesthood by Flavian,[3] Meletius' successor in the patriarchal chair of Antioch, and with it the responsibility of filling the pulpit in Antioch extensively, though by no means exclusively, for the next twelve years.[4] And it was in the same year[5] that he was ordained a priest, apparently at the age of 32, Chrysostom preached the first of his sermons Against the Jews.

---

[1] Baur, op. cit., I, 143. [2] Ibid., pp. 152-74.

[3] Socrates EH vi. 3 says that Evagrius, the successor of Paulinus, the other catholic Bishop in town (see below), ordained him. Baur (op. cit., I, 180) argues that this is out of the question.

[4] Baur, op. cit., I, 223.

[5] So Baur, op. cit., I, 284-85. But see pp. lxxxiii-xcii, below, for a further discussion of the chronology of these sermons.

The Great Church.--The heading to Sermon iv in Migne[1] asserts that it was delivered "in the Great Church." Very likely all of the sermons were.[2]

The Great Church, situated on the island or "New City" part of Antioch, was not the only Christian church in the city in Chrysostom's day. In the "Old City," that is, the rest of Antioch, there stood an edifice which was known as the "Old Church" (Palaia) to distinguish it from the Great Church, which was newer, and as the "Apostles' Church," because it was thought to go back to the days when Christianity was founded in Antioch. In addition to these churches there was a number of martyria, or chapels dedicated to the martyrs. By the end of the fourth century martyria were to be found all around the city's periphery.[3]

The Great Church itself, the one in which, it appears, Chrysostom did most of his preaching, was founded by Constantine in 327 and dedicated under Constantius in 341 on the occasion of the famous Synod of Antioch,[4] which ruled in favor of an orthodox Easter and an Arian theology. Luxurious, octagonal, girt with chambers, crowned with a tall gilded dome, it was notable for its orientation towards the west.[5] In the sixth century, long after

---

[1] V570 and P804 agree with Migne in assigning Sermon iv to the Great Church and in providing no headings which claim that any of the other sermons were preached there.

[2] This judgment is based, in part, on the observations that the Great Church was the largest edifice controled by the Antiochene Christians, and that Chrysostom was the most popular preacher in Antioch in his day.

[3] Baur, *op. cit.*, I, 30-34; Glanville Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1961), p. 336.

[4] Downey, *op. cit.*, pp. 342-50. Socrates *EH* ii. 8 says it took ten years to build (not fourteen).

[5] Socrates *EH* v. 22.

Chrysostom's day, it survived the Great Fire of 525 and even the catastrophic tremor of 526 that took perhaps 250,000 lives, only to burn to the ground in the general conflagration that followed a few days after the earthquake. Rebuilt a decade later by Justinian, it was plundered but left standing in 540 when the Persians systematically destroyed the rest of the city, was tilted off the vertical by an earthquake in 551, and was wholly wrecked, except for the dome--which was righted--by the quake of 588.[1]

But in Chrysostom's century its fate was linked to ecclesiastical controversies rather than to earthquakes and fires.

In 330, when the Great Church's foundations had barely been laid, Eustathius, the catholic bishop, was banished to Thrace and an Arian, Euphronius, was installed in his place, with the result that a segment of the catholics, loyal to Eustathius, broke away under the leadership of the Nicene priest, Paulinus, and formed a separate congregation of "Eustathians." Euphronius was succeeded by a number of Arian bishops in their turn, they, in 344, by the crypto-Arian, Leontius, he in 358 by the avowed Arian,[2] Eudoxius, and he, in 360, by the presumed Arian, Meletius. But Meletius, as it turned out, was not an Arian after all and was quickly exiled from Antioch when Constantius heard his exposition on the words, "The Lord formed me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old."[3]

During the bishopric of Leontius both Arian and Nicene

---

[1] Downey, op. cit., pp. 342-50, 523-25, 552, 568. Baur (op. cit., I, 31) dates its final collapse in 551.

[2] Theodoret EH ii. 25.

[3] Prov. 8:22 LXX. See Theodoret EH ii. 30.

Christians (other than the Eustathians) met for worship together in the Great Church, though when it came to the doxology, the Arians sang, "Glory be to the Father and the Son," and the orthodox, "Glory be to the Father through the Son," while Leontius, to conceal his true position, maintained a discreet silence at this point. Flavian (the future catholic bishop of Antioch) and Diodorus, though not yet priests, drew the catholics out to the martyria across the Orontes, conducted songfests there, and taught the people how to perform the psalms of David antiphonally. Leontius did not prevent them.[1]

So it was that when Constantius banished Meletius from Antioch and an open-Arian, Euzoius, was elected to fill his place, the congregation was ready to divide itself in two; and divide it did, the Arians ranking themselves under Euzoius, and the catholics, under the guardianship of Flavian and Diodorus, who functioned devotedly in the name of Meletius.[2]

When Constantius died, Julian called the exiled bishops home; Meletius returned, and the Nicaeans took over the Great Church.

But when Julian demanded that the Christians remove the bones of St. Babylas from Daphne, and they did so, marching with lighted tapers and chanting provocative Psalms, Julian, in anger, locked the doors of the Great Church and nailed them shut; then let the Arians have the building back; then let his namesake uncle, Prefect of the East, stupidly and indecently desecrate the Holy Table there;[3] and then finally died in Persia.

Jovian in his turn gave the church back to the catholics.[4]

---

[1] Theodoret EH ii. 24.

[2] Baur, op. cit., I, 52.

[3] Ibid. iii. 12-13; cf. Philostorgius EH vii. 10.

[4] Theodoret EH iv. 24.

Valens once more returned it to the Arians. Deprived even of the Old Church and the martyria, Flavian and Diodorus led the catholics in worship under the mountain cliffs, in heat and cold and sleet and snow; then to the river bank; and then, harried out of the city by Valens' troops, across the river westward to the Campus Martius.[1] A persecution occurred, so unnatural that the pagan orator, Themistius, was moved, with some success, to persuade Valens to put an end to it.[2]

Meanwhile Apollinaris, bishop of the rival metropolis of Laodicea, came to Antioch, gathered followers, and in 365 consecrated Vitalis bishop of those Christians who adhered to his point of view--making four bishops over the Christians of Antioch at the time, Paulinus (who had been ordained bishop by Lucifer in 362), Meletius (who was in exile), Euzoius, and Vitalis, leading four separate Christian bodies; not to speak of all the other Christian and pseudo-Christian groups represented in the city, Massalians, Luciferans, Paulinians (who followed Paul of Samosata), Novatians, and, perhaps, Euchites, Manichaeans, and others, all of whom, no doubt, gathered for meetings wherever they could.

In 378 Valens died at Adrianople. Under Gratian, Meletius came home. Finally, in 381, Theodosius ordered all Arians to vacate any church inside a city wall, and thus the catholics got the Great Church back. And the Old Church. And the martyria as well.

So it was that when Chrysostom began his sermons Against the Jews in 386 he had the use of the Great Church; yet it was only five years since its luxuriance, large capacity, and tall gilded dome had been delivered finally into the hands of the catholic bishop.[1]

---

[1] Ibid. iv. 24-25.

[2] Sozomen EH vi. 36.

How many came to hear?--How many people came to the Great Church to hear these sermons delivered, and how many Christians all told were there in Antioch?

In Sermon i Chrysostom says, "The apostles were twelve in number, and they won the world. The majority of the city is Christian, and yet some still suffer from the disease of Judaism."[2]

The reference here to the apostles is germane since Peter and Paul both worked in Antioch, there the believers--a "large company"--had first been called Christians, and thence Paul, Barnabas, Mark, and Silas had been sent out on missions to the world.[3]

How much larger had this "large company" grown by the end of the fourth century? Chrysostom says it had become the "majority of the city"; so this in turn raises the question, How large was the city?

Kraeling[4] thinks it conservative to guess that the population stood at 500,000, with 65,000 of this number being Jews. Baur[5] says the fourth-century population "cannot be exactly determined," but suggests 300-500,000, of which the "majority" were Christians.

---

[1] For the history of the Great Church and the ecclesiastical situation in Antioch in the fourth century, see Baur, op. cit., I, 49-53, and Downey, op. cit., 350-53, 363-70, 388, 410-13.

[2] See p. 16, below.

[3] Acts 11:19-26; 13:1-4; 15:36-41; Gal. 2:11-14.

[4] Carl H. Kraeling, "The Jewish Community at Antioch," JBL, LI (1932), 136-37.

[5] Op. cit., I, 36.

Haddad[1] contends that there is no basis for Kraeling's estimated number of Jews and no sure basis for calculating the total population, but he allows a city census of between 300,000 and 500,000, just as Baur does. Downey[2] gives a convenient list of all the ancient figures he has collected and lets it go at that.

Chrysostom gives more information than is contained in his "majority" expression. In his Sermon lxxxv *On Matthew*, in which he grumbles about how many poor there are for whom the priests must provide, and about how little the rank and file do in their behalf, he declares, "I suppose that by the grace of God those who assemble here amount to the number of 100,000." This figure may be compared with Libanius' remark associating the phrase, "all our city," with the figure "150,000,"[3] and with reports that in the earthquake that struck Antioch in 526, when the city was crowded with large numbers of country people, some 250,000 or 300,000[4] lost their lives.

Haddad, assuming that Chrysostom's 100,000 accounts for orthodox Christians only, tosses in a round 50,000 more for the *un*orthodox, adds 100,000 pagans and Jews on the thought that such an estimate leaves Chrysostom's 100,000 still in the "majority," doubles the resulting 250,000 to take care of the community's numerous slaves, and winds up with a possible population of 500,000. But he is both unconvinced and unconvincing. For surely ancient pastors counted converted slaves as "Christians,"[1] leaving little reason to add slaves to Chrysostom's figure. Further, Chrysostom, who provides the number 100,000, also calls his congregation a "majority" of the city, and 100,000 is hardly a major fraction of half a million.

---

[1] George Haddad, *Aspects of Social Life in Antioch in the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (New York: Hafner Publishing Co., 1949), pp. 62, 68-73.

[2] *Op. cit.*, pp. 582-83.

[3] *Letter* 1119. 3-4. Förster.

[4] Malalas 420.5 ff and Procopius *Wars* ii. 14. 6. Downey, *loc. cit.*

Obviously we are dealing here with impressions and estimates, and a person has to form that mental picture of the situation which seems most reasonable to himself. Downey's discretion was the better part of his valor when he simply presented evidence and avoided any numerical conclusion.

Paul Petit, on his part, is sure that the common people _as a whole_ were "thoroughly Christian," and that if the middle and upper classes were somewhat less so, yet the larger part even of the local senate itself was "indubitably" Christian.[2]

He bases his affirmation on such an observation in Libanius as, "We live among a people who are enemies of the gods," and on some of Julian's tart remarks in the _Misopogon_. But again, we are dealing with imponderables. Even the term "Christian" is obviously subjective. It is known that by the fifth century the Empire as a whole had turned "Christian," but one historian's commonplace remark that "standards of public conduct certainly had not improved with the Christianizing of the empire,"[3] is enough to raise again the hackneyed question as to just what this Christianization amounted to.

---

[1] Cf. Lactantius _Institutes_ v. 14. 17, "To us they are not slaves, but we regard them and speak of them as brothers in the spirit, as fellow-slaves in religion." C. J. Cadoux, _The Early Church and the World_ (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1925), p. 610.

[2] Paul Petit, _Libanius et la Vie Municipale à Antioche au IVe siècle après J.-C._ (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1955), pp. 200-202.

[3] A. E. R. Boak, "Foreword," in C. D. Gordon, _The Age of Attila_ (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 1960), p. ix.

The decay of paganism in the fourth century was more apparent than real, and if the people were withdrawing from the old-fashioned sacrificial liturgies, smokey and, for a generation, officially frowned on, part of the reason was doubtless that the theatres and games provided more immediate and spectacular excitement anyway. Petit's conclusion that the senate was indisputably Christian is undermined by the very statistics he provides of the religious preferences of known government officials in the second half of the fourth century.[1] Then may not the intimation in the Misopogon that the senate was mostly Christian be peevish exaggeration? No one takes Julian seriously when, in the same satire, he quips that Antioch had "more mimes than ordinary citizens."

At a time when adult baptism was a common practice,[2] and a prolonged catechumenate was a normal prerequisite to it,[3] many Antiochenes must simply have lost interest in paganism without bothering to get baptized into Christianity.

And what of those who did receive baptism? On the basis of his analysis of Chrysostom's sermons, Baur says,

> It still happened in the fourth century, that baptized Christians offered sacrifices to the gods, or at least kept their gold and silver statues in their houses; that Christians would give their daughters in marriage to a pagan priest of the gods; that others had two wives, or repudiate[d] their wives in order to take others.[4]

---

[1] Loc. cit.

[2] See, for example, Joachim Jeremias, Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries, trans. David Cairns (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960), pp. 87-97.

[3] See p. 70, below.

[4] Op. cit., I, 46.

Chrysostom, he says, complained

> that many clergy, through ambition and love of fame, or in order to be able to display the highest possible number of new converts, admitted wicked and faithless men to baptism, without any clear proof of their good intentions, and that they led people into the sanctuary who did not even deserve to set foot in the vestibule. Hence resulted falls and backslidings. Ten or twelve days after baptism they went back to their own ways of living.[1]

In fact, Baur's entire chapter, "Joy and Sorrow in the Preaching Office,"[2] provides one fascinating piece of evidence after another that Antiochian Christians wore their religion lightly.[3]

All of this deserves mention here, not, of course, in order to moralize but to show that the exact number of Christians in Antioch to whom Chrysostom preached is a figure that cannot be arrived at--and also to introduce the observations that he preached to a congregation in ferment, and that the outcome of things was not yet self-evident.

The "Jewish question" one among many.--In evaluating these sermons *Against the Jews* it is helpful to remember that the yeast for the religious ferment which agitated Antioch was not only Jewish. Paganism contributed its share, and so did Christian heterodoxy, like Arianism in its several shades, Apollinarianism, and the other isms, as also the schismatic orthodoxy of the Eustathians and of those others who set their Easter fast by the Jewish calendar.[4] Chrysostom said, "My battle is not with the Jews alone, but also with the pagans and many of the heretics."[1]

---

[1] Baur, *op. cit.*, I, 47. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 231-258.

[3] That all of this sounds pretty much like any pastorate in any age does not invalidate it.

[4] See Sermon iii, below.

Theologically, however, the Jews may well have been the most dangerous of the Church's many opponents when this series of sermons was preached. The greatest issue of the day concerned the nature of Christ, and on this score the Jews were as corrosive foes of Christian orthodoxy as were the pagans and the Anomoean Arians, for with such persons they held in common the belief that Christ was not, as the Nicene Council so solemnly affirmed He was, truly God.[2] But Arianism had overstretched itself at Sirmium and Rimini and was dying out, and paganism survived as a moral (or immoral[3]) rather than as a dogmatic force. Furthermore, Christianity in Antioch appears possibly to have weakened itself on the Jewish front through many years of accommodating itself to Judaism.[4]

In the early years of the fourth century the school of Lucian apparently enjoyed good relations with the local church even though whatever it taught was destined to break the Syllucianists and the

---

[1] Sermon vii. 3, p. 266, below. [2] See Sermon i, p. 6, below.

[3] Haddad (op. cit.) has written a defense of Antioch to prove that, in its entertainments and general moral tone, the ancient city was no worse than other large cities of its day. But his final conclusion (pp. 184-86) that such vices as he admits did exist there were imposed on the Antiochenes (a) by their outside rulers and (b) by the "nature of the city," betrays the apologetic zeal of a modern Syrian defending ancient Syrians. It requires only a shift of viewpoint to read "no worse than" as "just as bad as." A. J. Festugière (Antioche Païenne et Chrétienne ["Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome," Vol. CXCIV, Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard, 1959], p. 11) says that Antioch was no worse than modern cities; but writers are not wanting who wonder if modern cities--in America, at least--have not passed into a post-Christian era.

[4] The Jewish community at Antioch appears to have been founded in the days of Seleucus I Nikator, and to have flourished so well that in early Roman days it ranked among the three largest Jewish communities in the world. Herod the Great was among many Jews who

Arian controversy itself. Arianism manifestly provided a view of Christ which was closer to the Jewish view of Him than Christian orthodoxy did. Before Lucian there was Paul of Samosata, whose characteristic conception of the Logos, it has been suggested,[1] may have been created to approximate Jewish opinions. And in the second century the treatise To Autolycus, by the Antiochene bishop, Theophilus, was so "Jewish" as to contradict Paul,[2] omit the name "Jesus," and refer to Christ only obliquely, and then merely as a prophet.[3] It may or may not be significant in this connection that

---

became benefactors to the city and the Jews for a long time enjoyed not only many privileges but also increasing prosperity and pagan good will, but the outbreak of the Palestinian War (AD 66) and the occurrence of a great conflagration in Antioch (AD 70) aroused the fury of the populace against them. Many Jews were massacred at that time, but an effort by the people to deprive the Jews permanently of the basic privileges traditionally granted to their race in the Roman Empire was stifled by Titus. The Antiochene Jews then entered a period of obscurity lasting until the fourth century, when Jewish attempts to restore their national state by rebuilding the Jerusalem temple in the days of Constantine and Julian helped to reinvigorate the Antiochene synagogue in the days of Chrysostom. The Christianizing of the Empire, however, which resulted in the suppression of the Jews, led to a series of pogroms and riots in and around Antioch after AD 414, and the fanaticism of Simeon Stylites led to the confiscation and closing (at least temporarily) of synagogues in Syria. Further riots involving a heavy loss of life to the Antiochene Jews in connection with a series of games occurred in the time of Zeno (474-91) and again in 507. Finally, an attempt by Phocas (602-12) to force the Christianization of the Antiochene Jews led to a bloody revolt in 610 and their expulsion from the city. Antioch itself did not long survive as a Roman city. In the twelfth century only ten Jewish families were found in what was left of this once great ancient polis. See Kraeling, op. cit., pp. 130-60.

[1] Kraeling, op. cit., p. 155, His theology "looks like the precipitate of a serious attempt to find a common ground between what was conceivable to a Jew, and what was essential to a Christian."

[2] As, for example, in ii. 27, "As by disobedience man acquired death for himself, so by obedience to the will of God, whoever will can obtain eternal life for himself." See R. M. Grant, "The Problem of Theophilus," HTR, XLIII (July, 1950), 191.

[3] Grant, op. cit., pp. 188-90.

Chrysostom so prefers the name "Christ" in these sermons Against the Jews that, outside of terminal doxologies and Scripture quotations, he uses the name "Jesus" only twice.[1]

Two other factors which advanced the irritation of Christians towards the Jews ought to be mentioned. After the war with Hadrian the Jews lost interest in proselytizing in view of the fact that so many of their Gentile converts had either turned against them during the war, or had turned Christian. But in the fourth century they showed a renewed interest again in enlarging their numbers. In Babylonia, Raba and Rab, the outstanding teachers of Babylonian Jewry in their day, were "outspoken advocates of proselytism," and at times the number of proselytes seems to have been large. Sometimes whole villages requested admission to the fold.[2] It is at least possible that during the mild reign of Theodosius--which is when Chrysostom preached this series--the urge to proselytize found its way from Babylonia into Syria.

Again, whatever the official attitude of church and state may have been, and however anti-Jewish many ordinary Christians may well have been, there is evidence that many of the Faith got along very well at this time with their Jewish neighbors. Many of the proselytes won to Judaism in the fourth century were very likely Christians. The Councils of Elvira and Laodicea attest the fact that Christians in the fourth century attended the synagogues, shared ritual foods during Jewish feasts, and asked Jews to bless their crops. "Much of this friendliness, to be sure," Baron comments, "already had a suspicious coloring. It foreshadowed, in part, the growing belief among medieval Christians that the Jew was endowed with superior powers of healing and blessing crops because of his intimate association with demons."[1] And what attracted Christians the most, Baron adds, was not the Jewish religion as such, but its outward aspects, the Sabbath and the ceremonies.[2]

---

[1] Sermon vi, p. 184, and Sermon vii, p. 209, below. Sometimes Chrysostom omits "Jesus" from a verse that contains it, or changes it to "Christ." See, for example, his quotation of Heb. 10:10, p. 214, below.

[2] S. W. Baron, A Social and Religious History of the Jews (2nd ed., rev. and enlarged; Philadelphia: Jewish Publishing Society of America, 1952), II, 149.

There was occasion enough, then, for orthodox Christians in the fourth and fifth centuries to react strongly against the Jews.

Modern writers who are Jewish or who sympathize with Jews[3] often speak in aggrieved terms of the harsh treatment Christians directed against the Jews in the fourth and fifth centuries, and as likely as not cite Chrysostom's sermons Against the Jews as a case in point. Marcel Simon[4] speaks of the "anti-Semitism" which he says these sermons contain.

Cruel treatment of the Jews by Christians there was; by modern standards, inexcusable. But to call this harsh treatment "anti-Semitism" is to flirt with a real danger of distorting the crisis, for orthodoxy in the Christian Empire, much as it opposed the Jews, did not pick them out for specialized maltreatment as did, for example, the Nazis in World War II. It was intent on establishing its dominance over all non-catholic groups, not over Jews alone, and in point of fact was more cruel to deviant Christian sects than to the Jews. Indeed, in the fifth century government decrees were issued repeatedly to protect the legal and religious rights of the Jews, their private property, and their synagogues.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 189.

[2] Ibid., p. 149.

[3] Cf., for example, Baron (ibid., pp. 169-173), who, after speaking of the "three-cornered struggle" of the Jews with pagans and Christians, starts a chapter on "Incipient Medievalism" by saying that "Constantine's conversion to Christianity, . . . must have stunned Jewish leaders." Paul Goodman says Christians devised means to make Jews social lepers. History of the Jews (rev. and enlarged by Israel Cohen; New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1953), pp. 72-73.

[4] Verus Israel (2nd ed., enlarged; Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard, 1964), p. 262.

In 429 the Jews were permanently deprived of their patriarchate,[1] an office they had cherished for three centuries and which, for some time, had enjoyed the status of an honorary prefecture. At various times between the rise of Constantine and the death of Theodosius II the Jews lost the privilege of purchasing Christian slaves, of converting Christians (though not pagans) to Judaism, of being lawyers, soldiers, or civil servants, and of building or enlarging their synagogues.[2] Yet their rights to believe in and practice their religion, to own property, and to enjoy a fair trial, were specifically safeguarded by decrees issued from time to time.[3]

On the other hand, pagans and members of every conceivable non-catholic sect (Novatians, Sabbatians, Eunomians, Priscillianists, Borborians, Euchites, Audians, Tascodrogitae, etc., etc.[4]), were, during the same decades, banished to the hundredth milestone outside

---

[1] The Theodosian Code, ed. P. Krueger (Berlin: Weidmann, 1923-26), xvi. 8. 22. [Cf. translation by Clyde Pharr (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952), xvi. 8. 22.]

[2] Ibid. xvi. 8.

[3] Idem.

[4] Ibid. xvi. 5. 65.

Rome[1] and driven out of every other city in the Empire as well.[2] All their churches were ordered turned over to the orthodox.[3] Even the residences of Eunomian clerics were confiscated.[4] Donatism was to be utterly "extirpated."[5] But the Jews were not so treated.

It is helpful to recall also that some, at least, of the troubles that came on the Jews in the fourth and fifth centuries were of their own doing. Baron[6] admits that the Palestinian revolt of 352-53, which boomeranged on the Jews so disastrously,[7] may well have been unprovoked. Seaver[8] concedes that the Jewish way of celebrating Purim was riotous and wild,[9] and Margolis and Marx[10] observe that the influence of the patriarchate among the Jews themselves had been on the wane anyway since the early third century.

The repeated reissuance of laws protecting the synagogues, of course, reveals a necessity for such laws. Seaver,[11] Baron,[12] and others indict the Christian clergy as agitators and rabble-rousers responsible for the official and unofficial anti-Judaism of the fourth and fifth centuries. Jerome said the synagogue was both a fornicatress and an adulteress. Augustine said Jews should not be exterminated but should be left as living witnesses to God's wrath. Cyril drove the Jews out of Alexandria. Ambrose refused Communion to Theodosius until he promised to leave the synagogue at Callinicum in the ruins to which the bishop and monks there had reduced it. And Simeon Stylites prevented the Jews from getting back their synagogue in Antioch when Christians there riotously took it away from them.[1]

---

[1] _Ibid_. xvi. 5. 62.

[2] _Ibid_. xvi. 5. 64.

[3] _Ibid_. xvi. 5. 65.

[4] _Ibid_. xvi. 5. 58.

[5] _Ibid_. xvi. 6. 4.

[6] _Op_. _cit_., II, 398, n. 11.

[7] Sepphoris, Beth She'arim, and possibly other communities, were partially or completely destroyed by the Romans. Baron, _op_. _cit_., II, 179.

[8] J. E. Seaver, _Persecution of the Jews in the Roman Empire_ (_300-438_) ("University of Kansas Publications: Humanistic Studies," No. 30, ed. C. K. Hyder; Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Publications, 1952), pp. 216-17.

[9] Socrates says that in 414 at Inmestar, near Antioch, the Jews scourged a Christian child to death on a Haman's gallows shaped like a cross. _EH_ vii. 16.

[10] M. L. Margolis and A. Marx, _A History of the Jewish People_ (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publishing Society of America, 1945), pp. 224-28.

[11] _Op_. _cit_., passim.

[12] _Loc_. _cit_.

Which brings us back to Antioch and to that particular Christian leader, St. John Chrysostom, whose anti-Judaic messages may have helped to lay the ground work for Simeon's fanaticism and for much of the anti-Jewish cruelty which characterized the Middle Ages. This much can be said for him: He led out in the destruction of a pagan temple,[2] but he never advocated the over throw of a Jewish synagogue. Although he could say in his Sermons Against the Jews that the Jews were ready to be slaughtered,[3] yet in his twenty-first sermon On the Statues he reported twice that Flavian had petitioned the Emperor on behalf of both the pagans and the Jews.

And this leads on to the next question, How many Judaizers were there about whom Chrysostom was so concerned?

The number of Judaizers.--How serious was the problem of Judaizing in Antioch? Were there really many Christians who were in danger of adulterating their faith?

---

[1] See Seaver, op. cit., pp. 32-76.

[2] Theodoret EH v. 29; Baur, op. cit., II, 390-91, disputes the point.

[3] Sermon i, p. 8.

The fact is that Chrysostom is so far from providing a clear answer to this question that he apparently does not know the answer to it himself!

In Sermon i he uses such phrases as "many are accustomed" to attend the Jewish festivals,[1] and "many of the Faith (may I never call them faithful)" keep watch by the Synagogue of Matrona in Daphne.[2] But in this same sermon he says that "some people" hold a high regard for things Jewish,[3] and "some" consider the synagogue sacred.[4] It is evident that Chrysostom has never gone to Daphne to count the Judaizing Christians there, for he says, "I have heard" that many go up there.[5] And when he gets to his agitated appeal at the close of Sermon i, he first begs all his auditors to hunt out one Judaizer each, and then with a gasp ("God forbid that there should be that many"), suggests instead that groups of two or three, or of ten or twenty, bring in one each.[6]

In Sermon viii there is a similar uncertainty. "Let us look and see *if* any of our brothers have fallen,"[7] and then a few moments later, "We must not neglect our brothers *who have fallen*."[8] There follows an involved section where he implores the crowd not to spread damaging reports as to the numbers who went to the synagogue. "If there were many who fasted, don't parade it, beloved." But a few breaths later, "If the number really is small, . . ."[9]

But the clearest evidence of his own uncertainty is found in Sermon iv, where he states frankly, "If it had been possible for me to know personally those who are going over there," I would not have needed to seek your help.[1] So the vigor of these sermons, and the intensity of their appeals, and the pounding pressure of their oft-repeated arguments, do not prove how large the specific danger was, for Chrysostom had a passion for both souls and controversy and tended to be intense and didactic in all of his sermons.

---

[1] i, p. 4.

[2] i, p. 11.

[3] i, p. 11.

[4] i, p. 21.

[5] i, p. 25.

[6] ii, p. 38.

[7] viii, p. 233.

[8] viii, p. 239.

[9] viii, pp. 244-45.

But at least this can be said, that there were sufficient Judaizers in Antioch to cause Chrysostom sufficient concern to preach some earnest sermons about them during the first two or three years of his priesthood and to keep him returning to their situation incidentally in his sermons over the years, though not enough to compel him, so far as we know, to devote whole sermons to the Judaizers again after these sermons *Against the Jews* were done.

F. *Analysis of the Sermons*

The sermons as a whole.--In his treatise *On the Priesthood*, in which he defends himself for resisting ordination when it was first offered to him, Chrysostom speaks of the importance of the priest's duty to deal adequately and advisedly with heretics and he says that a priest must be experienced in debate; for even though he himself is unshaken by opposition, if the simple folk he shepherds see him unable to answer his opponents' assertions, they will explain his inability, not on his personal weakness but on an assumed unsoundness in his doctrines. In this way, he goes on, a priest's incompetence can ruin a large number of people, who, though they do not join the enemy, nonetheless come to doubt what they had firmly believed. In conclusion he asks, somewhat pathetically, Is it really an evidence of pride, then, to be unwilling to become a priest?[1]

---

[1] iv, p. 103.

As he sets out now to meet the Jewish question as an ordained priest at last, it is evident from what he says in these sermons Against the Jews that the Jews, with their attractive spectacles and exciting claims as healers, are appealing successfully to the lowest classes and prostitutes, to the masses who attend theaters, to the city's entire corps of entertainers,[2] and to the community's diseased.[3] To Christians they hold a special appeal because, in addition to what they can offer pagans, they possess the same sacred books the Christians revere, reverently stored in the ark of the synagogue,[4] and the simple fact that their way of life was originally ordained by God.[5]

An indeterminate number of Christians regard the elements of the Jewish religion as being as sacred as those of Christianity, if not more so.[6] They attend synagogue at least on festal occasions,[7] date the Easter fast by the Jewish Passover,[8] keep vigils at the synagogue of Matrona in Daphne,[9] occasionally drag each other to the synagogue court to take oaths,[10] summon Jewish enchanters to cure their fevers,[11] and, in particular, participate in the New Year's spectacle of the Trumpets, in the Day of Atonement fast and, perhaps, in the Fast of Gedaliah as well, not to mention the Festival of Tabernacles.[1]

---

[1] On the Priesthood iv. 4-9.

[2] i, p. 9; iii, p. 50 [3] i, p. 32; viii, p. 249. [4] i, p. 21.

[5] ii, p. 47; iv, pp. 100-101. [6] i, pp. 10-11.

[7] i, pp. 3-4; ii, p. 50; iv, p. 80; viii, p. 262.

[8] iii, pp. 53, 63, 72-73.

[9] i, p. 25. [10] i, p. 11. [11] Cf. viii, p. 252.

These Christian "Judaizers" are not interested in identifying themselves with the Jews completely, however. They refuse to enter into the Jews' primitive barefoot dances in the market place.[2] When their pastors warn that observing any part of the law can cost a man the loss of all grace, they reply quickly that fasting is only one commandment;[3] that the difference between Christianity and Judaism is only a little thing;[4] and when rebuked for keeping the Easter fast out of step with the Church, they do not justify themselves so much on Jewish grounds as on the basis that this was the good old-fashioned practice of the best Antiochene Christians prior to the innovations of the Council of Nicaea.[5]

The reaction of the non-Judaizing church member to all of this is highly instructive. His attitude is one of sheer indifference. "Why should I care?" "What do he and I have in common?"[6] Men permit their wives to attend the Jewish spectacles unrebuked,[7] and some Christians even protect and conceal the Judaizers and thus become, in Chrysostom's opinion, accessories to their crime.[8]

It is in such a situation as this, then, that Chrysostom presents his sermons. The Jewish way of life, he freely admits, was once salutary and lawful, but, he urges, its time has now expired, so that today it is unlawful and very harmful.[9] Its observance, indeed, is an irritation to God.[1] The destruction of the city and temple of Jerusalem under the Romans shows that the Jewish way of life has come to an end,[2] and the predictions of the prophets prove that it will never again be restored.[3] Further, in place of the Jewish sacrifices, God has instituted the Christian Supper,[4] and in place of the Jewish priesthood, the Melchizedekal priesthood of Christ.[5] Christians, in consequence, should have nothing to do with Judaism any more.

---

[1] See p. lii, n. 7, above. [2] i, p. 18. [3] ii, p. 46.

[4] iv, p. 87. [5] iii, p. 60. [6] iv, pp. 103-105.

[7] ii, p. 50. [8] i, pp. 20, 37. [9] ii, pp. 47-48.

The Jewish synagogue, in turn, is a hotbed of vice.[6] Demons dance there[7] and all the immoral riffraff of the city collects there.[8] The sacredness of the Scriptures preserved in the synagogues cannot counteract the wickedness of those who gather there.[9] The Jews themselves are nothing more than demon-possessed Christ-killers.[10] Christians must strictly avoid Jewish assemblies.[11] They should be aghast at the thought of fellowshipping with men who killed their Lord--who, indeed, still cry out, "Crucify Him, crucify Him!"[12]--and, instead of being attracted to the synagogues, Christians should seek to become temples of God themselves.[13]

Those Christians who keep the Easter fast at a time different from the rest of the body are weakening the Church and hazarding their souls. For the good of all concerned they must press back into harmony with the Church.[1]

---

[1] i, pp. 6, 9.

[2] iii, p. 64; iv, pp. 93-97; v, p. 109; vi, p. 200.

[3] v, the entire sermon.

[4] iii, p. 67.

[5] vii, p. 214.

[6] i, p. 10.

[7] ii, p. 50.

[8] i, pp. 9, 11.

[9] i, pp. 24-26.

[10] i, pp. 26-27.

[11] i, p. 27.

[12] i, p. 20; cf. p. 31.

[13] vi, pp. 196-97.

And all those who are indifferent to the plight of the Judaizers must realize that they cannot claim Christ as their Head unless they recognize in their brethren Christ's limbs.[2] They must become concerned, stirring up their zeal to a much higher pitch than it is at present,[3] and go after the Judaizers as if they were hunting game,[4] gathering treasure,[5] or healing the sick.[6] Either alone or in the company of family and friends, they must ferret them out,[7] report them to the clergy,[8] visit them where they live,[9] invite them to a meal in their own homes,[10] and by every means from argument to compulsion,[11]--and at any cost to themselves,[12]--get them back into the Church again.

As for the ill who are tempted to seek Jewish healers, it is better for them to remain ill than to get beholden to the devil.[13] Demons don't heal anyway.[14] And if a man resists every persuasion to rely on magic and dies of his disease in consequence, he will receive in the life to come nothing less than the glory and crown of a martyr.[15]

As for those who respond to these appeals and go out and save a Judaizer from his waywardness, what will they receive? They will find they have earned the praises of the Church here, the eulogies of the Father above, rich rewards in this life, resurrection into the life to come, and great confidence at the judgment seat of Christ.[1]

---

[1] iii, pp. 74-79.
[2] i, p. 14; iv, p. 106.
[3] vii, p. 227.
[4] i, p. 38; ii, pp. 41-42; iv, p. 107.
[5] viii, p. 242.
[6] i, p. 38; iv, p. 106.
[7] i, pp. 19, 38-39; vii, p. 227; viii, p. 264.
[8] i, p. 37.
[9] viii, pp. 247-50.
[10] vi, pp. 197-98.
[11] i, p. 17.
[12] iv, p. 106.
[13] i, pp. 35-37; vi, pp. 249-56.
[14] i, p. 34; viii, pp. 261-62.
[15] viii, pp. 256, 259-60.

Sermon i.--The first sermon, "Dangers Ahead," is a warning that the Jewish New Year season (roughly September or October) is approaching with its New Year's Day Trumpets, Gedaliah and Day of Atonement Fasts, and week-long Festival of Tabernacles. Chrysostom knows that to the spectacle-conscious Antiochenes, Christian and non-Christian alike, these occasions will be highly attractive, and, from the Christian point of view, thoroughly dangerous. His goal is to keep the Christians from participating in them.

The sermon begins with a review of the previous Sunday's message against the Anomoeans, a discourse he had planned to complete today until he realized how many church members were expecting to attend the synagogue rites.[2]

Approximately sixty Biblical passages are cited or alluded to in this sermon, and ordinarily each is taken with little respect to its historical context and is applied as if it were valid at face value in the fourth century. For example, Jer. 3:3, "You have the face of a harlot. You behave shamelessly with everyone," is taken as proof that the Jews of Antioch are prostitutes still.[3] And contemporary Jews cry out (present tense), "Crucify Him, crucify Him."[4]

This is the coarsest of the sermons. The synagogue is emphatically declared to be no better than a theatre, and to be a whorehouse, a hyena's cave, a dwelling-place for demons, as profane as a pagan temple and much more dangerous.[1] The Jews themselves are more licentious than lecherous wild animals, are "Christ-killers," and are possessed with demons.[2]

---

[1] i, pp. 37-39; viii, pp. 266-67.

[2] i, p. 4.

[3] i, p. 10.

[4] i, p. 20.

Some of this sermon's arguments are used in other sermons as well, such as the arguments dealing with sacred books[3] and miracle-working false prophets.[4] At the same time, it is unique in this series in that it contains not only the usual appeal for action at the end, but also a second plea, a very impassioned one, in its center,[5] a feature in keeping with the intense emotional pressure of the message as a whole. It is also the most famous of the sermons, containing as it does the frequently cited incident of the woman being dragged to the synagogue to swear an oath.[6] Since it does not slow down to develop any single passage exegetically, it sustains a soaring oratical tone more consistently than any of the others.

Sermon ii.--The second sermon, "All or Nothing," is based on Gal. 5:2-5 and develops the theme that a Christian must separate himself entirely from Judaism. If a Christian practices circumcision or fasts with the Jews, keeping even "one Commandment imposes on you the entire yoke of the law," he says, just as having one foot caught in a trap means that the whole of a bird is ensnared.[7]

It was preached five days before the Day of Atonement, and about ten days after Sermon i.[1]

---

[1] i, pp. 10, 24-27.

[2] i, pp. 28, 17, 27.

[3] i, pp. 21-27; cf. vi, pp. 192-95.

[4] i, p. 32; cf. viii, pp. 249-50.

[5] i, pp. 12-19.

[6] i, pp. 11-13.

[7] ii, p. 47.

This sermon is much milder than the first one in its treatment of the Jews. Indeed, it is hardly a sermon "against the Jews" at all, being directed almost entirely to Judaizers. Ad hominem arguments are rare and there is even a warm tribute to the good effects of the law when used at the proper time. "The law is not opposed to Christ!" says the preacher. "It has made our souls more apt to receive the greater philosophy."[2]

This sermon is interrupted by a lacuna which, in view of the shortness of what is left in comparison with the length of the other sermons in this series, may represent half the original sermon's length.[3] The extant material resumes at a point within the appeal for action, with Chrysostom urging husbands to correct their Judaizing wives; and it ends--in contrast to the generally mild tone of the message as a whole--with a very sharp rebuke and an order that Judaizing catechumens are to be excluded from the church building, and Judaizing members from the Table.[4]

Sermon iii.--The third sermon, "Press Together," is directed to a specific, small group of Judaizers who are regulating their Easter fast by the Jewish Passover.[5] Its main Scriptural basis is the book of I Corinthians, and it constitutes an appeal to sectarian Christians to press back into the Church for the good of all.

Other arguments used besides the one based on I Corinthians include the sacred authority of Nicaea,[6] the razing of the Jewish

---

[1] ii, p. 40.
[2] ii, pp. 42, 47.
[3] ii, p. 48.
[4] ii, pp. 51-52.
[5] iii, pp. 53-55.
[6] iii, pp. 61-63.

Temple,[1] the fulfillment of Old Testament types,[2] the real purpose for Lent,[3] the impossibility of keeping the exact date of the Crucifixion,[4] and the need for each individual to have a pure conscience at Communion.[5] But since this sermon presents special difficulties, a separate section is devoted to it below.[6]

Sermon iv.--The fourth sermon, "Both Place and Time," is based on Deut. 16:5-6 and Num. 9:7-11, passages in which "the law specifies not only the time but also the place where the Jewish festivals were to be observed."[7] The "place" is shown to be more essential than the "time"--Jerusalem being, in fact, the sine qua non of all ceremonial requirements, and the conclusion is drawn that when God overthrew Jerusalem, He destroyed the entire structure of the Jewish way of life.[8]

Like Sermons i and ii, Sermon iv was preached a number of days (ten) prior to a Day of Atonement,[9] for the purpose of preventing Christian participation in the chief annual Jewish fast. Some of the rancor of Sermon i reappears. Jews are called "those assassins"[10] and the "God-fighting Jews,"[11] but Christian Judaizers are castigated as being even worse than the Jews themselves,[12] revealing that Chrysostom is ultimately less anti-Semitic than anti-sin."

The first main supporting argument in this sermon is that if God wills an act the deed is virtuous even though it is murder, and that if God opposes it, it is sinful even though it seem to be a kindness. It follows that because God has today removed the legal basis for the Jewish way of life, Jewish fasts are no longer virtuous but cursed and sinful.[1]

---

[1] iii, p. 64.

[2] iii, pp. 66-68.

[3] iii, pp. 68-70.

[4] iii, p. 73.

[5] iii, pp. 70-72.

[6] See pp. lxvii-lxxxii, below.

[7] iv. p. 91.

[8] iv. p. 102.

[9] iv, p. 80.

[10] iv, p. 88.

[11] iv, p. 103.

[12] iv, p. 87.

The second main supporting argument is based on the loyal Jews of long ago who showed their adherence to the Jewish polity by _not_ offering sacrifices or observing festivals when exiled in Babylon.[2] From them it is concluded not only that modern Jews, exiled from Jerusalem, ought to do the same, but also that Jewish rituals were dispensable even in Old Testament times[3] and originated merely as a concession to weakness from which God always intended to lead the Jews away.[4]

The sermon closes with the usual spirited appeal for the strong to help the weak.[5] "How unreasonable it is to stand idle when souls in such numbers are being lost! To think that we are in no danger, when our very limbs--our fellow church members--are rotting away!"

Sermon v.--The fifth sermon, "Prophecy Fulfilled," is an attempt to prove from prophecy that Jerusalem will never be rebuilt and that consequently the Jews should abandon their pretext for continuing their rituals, their hope that they will someday regain their city. This sermon thus provides an elaboration of the argument from the razed temple in Sermon i,[6] and from the indispensable requirement of Jerusalem as the cultic center in Sermon iv.

The chief prophecies taken up in opposition to the Jewish hope are the relatively clear-cut statement of Christ's in Luke 21:24,

---

[1] iv, pp. 82-87.
[2] iv, pp. 93-97.
[3] iv, pp. 97-98.
[4] iv, pp. 99-100.
[5] iv, pp. 102-107.
[6] i, pp. 30-31.

"Jerusalem will be trodden down by many Gentiles until the times of the many Gentiles are fulfilled,"[1] and the more mystical statements of Daniel 8-12, particularly those setting forth the "Seventy Weeks."[2] Chrysostom builds confidence in these particular prophecies by showing that other predictions Christ made have come true[3] and by arguing that if prophecy has been proved correct when it limits set periods for the captivities in Egypt, Babylon, and under Antiochus Epiphanes,[4] it should be regarded as trustworthy when, following the close of the Seventy Weeks, it sets no time limit for the present captivity in progress under the Romans.[5] Furthermore, the futile attempts to rebuild the temple in the days of Hadrian, Constantine, and Julian[6] provide pragmatic endorsement to prophecy that any Jew ought to be able to understand.

Chrysostom follows the prophecies against Jerusalem with evidence that the Old Testament prophets themselves foretold that the Christian sacrifice would replace the old Jewish sacrifice, and that the new worship would be universal and not localized in Jerusalem.[7]

This sermon is unique in this series in that it quotes extensively from Josephus Antiquities vi.[8] Some perplexity as to the relationship of this sermon to the others in the series is caused by the statement at the beginning that it is being preached in fulfillment of a promise Chrysostom had made (apparently at his most recently previous sermon),[9] and by the claim made very near the beginning that the previous sermon had brought "a fitting close" to the struggle with the Jews.[1] Usener thinks that the "previous sermon" referred to has been lost,[2] and he may be right, though the short review of the previous sermon which follows[3] covers the substance in the extant Sermon iv.

---

[1] v, pp. 110-11.
[2] v, pp. 148-56.
[3] v, pp. 111-22.
[4] v, pp. 126-46.
[5] v, pp. 146-56.
[6] v, pp. 156-61.
[7] v, pp. 161-66.
[8] v, pp. 143-48.
[9] v, p. 108.

This fifth sermon includes a long excursus on Christ's integrity as a prophet.[4] Lukyn Williams[5] does not hide his disgust that this particular section, which begins with a proposal to discover "what kind of character Christ had and what His manner of life was," should proceed to analyze the credibility of His predictions rather than the events of His career. Williams sees little value in predictive prophecy anyway.

It is hardly fair, however, to judge a man of one clime and century by the tastes of another clime and century. The interpretation of the Seventy Weeks of Daniel 9 as representing at least approximately four hundred and ninety years in Jewish history was for centuries an accepted element in the work of many famous Christians, including Augustine, Bede, Aquinas, Savonarola, Luther, and Melanchthon.[6]

In the early church, expositions of Daniel 9 very similar to that found in Sermon v are to be found in such writers as Hippolytus, Julius Africanus, Eusebius Pamphili, Polychronius, and Theodoret,[7] which is only natural, since the LXX translates the Hebrew of Dan. 9:24 as "seventy weeks of years." The attack on Daniel launched by the Neo-Platonist, Porphyry (231-301), had not yet affected Christian confidence in making such use of the book of Daniel; indeed, when Jerome became aware of Porphyry's attack, he vigorously defended what was already a traditional position, interpreting the Seventy Weeks as four hundred ninety years, and insisting that Daniel does offer true predictive prophecy rather than a misleading commentary on the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, as Porphyry asserted.[1]

---

[1] v, pp. 108-109.

[2] See pp. lxxxvii-lxxxviii, below.

[3] v, pp. 109-110.

[4] v, pp. 111-22.

[5] Adversus Judaeos (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1935), pp. 132-39.

[6] L. E. Froom, The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers (Washington, D.C.: The Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1946-1954), I, 894-895; II, 156-157, 484-505, 528-529.

[7] Froom, op. cit., I, 456-457.

Thus Sermon v is at least a product of its times, and represents a position which has had the endorsement of a large number of Christian exponents through the centuries.

This sermon is by far the longest in the series, being nearly twice the average length of the others. Yet it contains the shortest "appeal for action" of any of the sermons, since Chrysostom seems to have become suddenly aware that the great length of his message had produced weariness in his audience.[2]

Sermon vi.--The sixth sermon, "The Cross the Cause of Their Woe," takes up the question, Why are the Jews undergoing greater punishment today, when their sins are less heinous, than they did long ago, when their sins were truly enormous? The answer given is that they are being punished for calling Christ an impostor and killing Him.[3]

This sermon proves that Christ was not an impostor by asserting that God has abandoned the Jews[4] (rather than honoring them as

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 440-450.

[2] v, pp. 166-67.

[3] vi, pp. 171-78.

[4] vi, pp. 178-79.

He did Phineas),[1] and proves that God has abandoned them by pointing to the razing of the temple and the removal of the gift of prophecy[2] and of all the other sacred things of their former way of life[3], a removal so complete that their present "patriarchs," lacking authoritative ordination now that the temple and its ritual have vanished, are not priests at all but hucksters[4], and the ark in which the Jews store the law is no better than the little boxes sold at the market, or rather, is inferior to them.[5]

As usual this sermon is based on Scripture. The prophecy of Isaiah 53 is used to prove that killing Christ was indeed a crime, and Lev. 7:25 LXX; 8:1-34 is quoted and discussed at length to show, by contrast, how invalid are any claims made for the priesthood of the modern patriarchs.

That Sermon vi was preached shortly after Sermon v (the heading in Migne says it was preached on the next day after), is clear from the review given of the previous sermon and from Chrysostom's complaint that his previous sermon had made his voice so weak he would be unable to preach so long again today.[6]

Chrysostom observes that he is preaching this sermon on a Martyrs' Day, an observation which leads him to justify the timeliness of his topic by saying that the martyrs will be pleased with a sermon against the Jews since they hate the Jews for killing the Christ whom the martyrs love.[7]

The martyrs are not the only ones who hate the Jews. God hates them;[1] and "I hate them" too.[2] The harshness of the first sermon is present again in this one. The synagogue is once more a brothel and a resort of demons.[3]

---

[1] vi, p. 176.

[2] vi, pp. 178-83.

[3] vi, pp. 185-86.

[4] vi, pp. 186-91.

[5] vi, pp. 194-95.

[6] vi, pp. 168-71.

[7] vi, pp. 169-70.

The appeal for action at the end is in two parts. The first calls on Christians not to look to the polluted Jewish temple but to become temples of God themselves, and to help others to do the same.[4] The appeal then urges the strong to invite the Judaizers into their homes and to get them to break their fast by eating a meal right there before their eyes.[5]

Sermon vii.--The seventh sermon, "Christ and Melchizedek," fulfills a claim made near the close of the fifth sermon: "I could have shown you, in addition, that henceforth there was to be no sacrifice, or priesthood, or royalty, among the Jews. The destruction of the city has, of course, made all these points perfectly plain, but I could have called in prophets to tell you about it."[6]

The first part of the sermon,[7] which is introduced as a review of the already familiar theme[8] that the destruction of the temple proves the demise of the Jewish way of life, discusses at length the "water of conviction" for adulteresses[9] and the obvious implications to be derived from the non-use of the associated curse today.

The body of the sermon, which follows, argues for the superiority of Christ's sacrifice to the sacrifices of the Old Testament[10] and of Christ's Melchizedekal priesthood to the Levitical priesthood,[1] hewing rather closely to the reasoning of the book of Hebrews.

---

[1] vi, p. 182.

[2] vi, p. 193.

[3] vi, p. 196; cf., i, p. 10.

[4] vi, pp. 196-97.

[5] vi, pp. 197-98.

[6] v, p. 166.

[7] vii, pp. 199-204.

[8] v, pp. 30-31; iii, p. 64; iv, p. 102; vi, p. 178.

[9] Num. 5:12-28.

[10] vii, pp. 204-14.

The appeal for action in behalf of the Judaizers presents a bright visualization of the joy of meeting a saved soul in the after life and of the effectiveness of the intercession of saved souls in behalf of their benefactors.[2]

Sermon viii.--The eighth sermon, "Casualties, Charms, and Champions," was preached shortly after the Jewish "fast," that is the Jews' "drunken orgy," was over. Some Christians have taken part in this fast it appears; and whereas the other sermons appeal for the strong to help the weak before they fall, this one appeals to the strong to help those who have succumbed or, as he puts it, who have fallen wounded or dead in our battle with the (by now defeated) enemy.[3] And whereas the other sermons contain an appeal for action, this sermon consists almost entirely of an appeal for action.

The argument to persuade the strong to rescue the fallen is derived from God's care for Adam and Cain after each of them had fallen, Paul's concern for the adulterer in Corinth, and the Good Samaritan's ministry to the wounded man on the road to Jericho.[4]

Chrysostom asks the people to help in two specific ways, first by suppressing and minimizing all rumors to the effect that large numbers of Christians have Judaized, because rumors themselves can wreak great damage,[5] and second, by visiting with those who fell and talking to them. In fact, he provides something of a "layman's manual for reconverting Judaizers."[6] Always the pastor, Chrysostom gives detailed instruction regarding the best way to call on Judaizers in their homes, including what to say in different cases. Special attention[1] is given to the arguments of physically ill Christians who hope for healing through Jewish amulets and charms. But apparently Chrysostom has more in mind than to put words into his lay visitors' mouths, for he is soon talking directly to the members in his own audience who are being tempted to seek healing from Jewish sources.

---

[1] vii, pp. 214-24. [2] vii, pp. 224-29. [3] viii, pp. 230-32.

[4] viii, pp. 233-42. [5] viii, pp. 242-47. [6] viii, pp. 247-50.

He reasons from the warning against false prophets in Deut. 13:1-3,[2] from Job, Lazarus, and other famous Bible invalids,[3] and from the discomforts of a guilty conscience,[4] then switches suddenly to the wonderful reward vouchsafed to those who die from fever after resisting people who have tried to persuade them to call in the Jews. They will each receive, he assures them, a martyr's crown.[5]

The closing appeal first calls attention to Christ, who did not sit in Jerusalem but went out seeking the lost,[6] and then to the contrast in the relative felicities of the man who buried his talent and of those men who put their talents to work.[7]

Problems in Sermon iii

The third sermon is related to the problem of the dating of Easter, a controversy which vexed the church for many centuries. Because of its peculiar difficulties, this sermon demands special attention.

---

[1] viii, pp. 249-50.

[2] viii, p. 249.

[3] viii, pp. 250-52.

[4] viii, pp. 255-56.

[5] viii, pp. 256-61.

[6] viii, pp. 263-65.

[7] viii, pp. 265-67.

Three major phases of the Easter controversy.--By the end of the fourth century the Easter controversy had gone through two major stages and was well into its third. In the first stage, which reached a climax under Victor of Rome near the end of the second century, the issue was whether Easter could be celebrated on any given day of the week, or only on a Sunday. The Quartodecimans insisted that it should be observed on the 14th of Nisan regardless of the day of the week on which that date fell, but most of the church insisted that Sunday was the only appropriate day for Easter and seems to have chosen in particular the Sunday which followed the 14th of Nisan. The Montanists followed a third system, however, which embodied elements of both the catholic and the Quartodeciman systems. They regarded a fixed date, the 6th (or 7th) of April, as the day for the Passover, and kept Easter on this date when it fell on a Sunday, and on the following Sunday when it did not.[1] The first phase of the controversy established Sunday as the only suitable day for Easter in the church catholic.

The second phase of the controversy concerned itself with the question, "Which Sunday?" or rather, "Which Passover?" The Antiochene school was content to let the Jews determine the date for the Passover and then to observe Easter on the Sunday which came next after it; but the Alexandrian school insisted on calculating the Passover independently of the Jews (Alexandria was a center of mathematical and astronomical studies) by first determining the vernal equinox and making sure that Easter came after that. It is characteristic of the times that those who sided with the independent stand of the Alexandrians were strongly opposed to following the Jews of their own time and yet were quite positive that in placing the Passover when they did, they were following the correct reckoning of the Old Testament Jews.[1]

---

[1] Sozomen op. cit. vii. 18, though Louis Duchesne (Early History of the Christian Church [English trans. from the 4th ed. London: John Murray, Albermarle St., 1909-23] , II, 460) says they kept it regularly on April 6.

The Council of Nicaea (325) ruled in favor of the Alexandrian system, in general at least, and the first canon of the Synod of Antioch (341) confirmed this decision for the Antioch area. As the second stage of the controversy ended, catholic Christians were agreed that they should not follow the Jewish reckoning but should set Easter on the first Sunday after the first full moon following the vernal equinox, and by all means to avoid holding Easter on the day of the Jewish Passover.

But this left open the problem of how the vernal equinox should be calculated, which led to the third great question. So various were the methods employed in different areas around the Mediterranean in a sincere attempt to comply with the provisions of Nicaea, that it is said that in 387, the very year of the Passover observances which concern Chrysostom in this third sermon, Easter was kept in Alexandria on April 25, in Italy on April 18, and in Gaul on March 21--the very date of the Jewish Passover![2] This phase of the paschal debate was not fully settled, in favor of the Alexandrian calendation, until the time of Charlemagne.

---

[1] See, e.g., Duchesne, op. cit., II, 110-11; Eusebius EH vii. 32; Socrates EH v. 22.

[2] "Paschal Controversies," ODC. This article cites "Augustine Letter xxiii," presumably an error for "Ambrose Letter xxiii." However, even though this latter epistle deals with the dating of Easter, it does not provide the specific information given in the ODC.

The Sabbatian Protopaschites.--This survey has taken into account the major elements in the controversy, but mention must also be made of certain minor elements. The heading to Sermon iii in Migne says that this particular message was addressed to the "Protopaschites." In order to analyze the use of this expression it is necessary to make a study of the Sabbatians, for the reason that the Sabbatians are sometimes referred to as Protopaschites.

The seventh canon of the First Council of Constantinople (381) states the conditions under which a certain group called the "Sabbatians" might be permitted entry into the church catholic.

According to Socrates[1] and Sozomen,[2] the Sabbatians were the followers of one, Sabbatius, a Jew, a convert to Novatianism, who, around the year 385,[3] came to hold the view that Easter must be tied to contemporary Jewish calculations for the Passover.

Socrates says that Sabbatius inaugurated certain schismatic assemblies, and that when he was

> reading one day at one of these meetings that passage in the Gospel where it is said, "Now it was the Feast of the Jews called the Passover," he added what was never written nor heard of before: "Cursed be he that celebrates the Passover out of the days of unleavened bread."

The more simple of the Novatians, Socrates adds, flocked around him--with a disastrous outcome:

> For shortly afterwards he kept this feast in anticipation of the Christian Easter; and many according to their custom

---

[1] Socrates EH v. 21; vii. 5. Cf. NPNF (2), II, 129-30, 155-56.

[2] Sozomen EH vii. 18.

[3] That is, around the sixth year of the reign of Theodosius. Socrates EH v. 21.

> flocked to him. . . . But while they were passing the night in the accustomed vigils, a panic as if caused by evil spirits fell upon them, as if Sisinnius their [Novatian] bishop were coming with a multitude of persons to attack them,

and in the panic which ensued, seventy were trampled to death, with the result that many of his followers deserted Sabbatius, though some stayed with him.

Sozomen adds the information that, after adopting his new views,

> Sabbatius adhered to the usage of the Jews; and unless all happened to observe the feast at the same time, he fasted, according to the custom, but in advance, and celebrated the Passover with the usual prescriptions by himself. He passed the Saturday [i.e., the Sabbath], from the evening to the appointed time, in watching and in offering up the prescribed prayers; and on the following day he assembled with the multitude, and partook of the mysteries.

Sozomen then goes on to say that Sabbatius found a great many imitators, and that his way of handling Easter became a national custom in Phrygia and Galatia.[1]

In attempting to identify the Sabbatian Protopaschites the question must be asked, Were they, by any chance, a variety of Quartodeciman? That is, did they insist on closing their pre-Easter fast and observing Easter on the precise day of the Jewish Passover? The answer, apparently, is No. Sabbatius said only, "Cursed be he that celebrates the Passover out of the days of unleavened bread." This requirement is broad enough to allow Easter to fall at any point within the entire week of Unleavened Bread and so is closer to the position of the Montanists and of the second-century church than to that of the Quartodecimans, since it could be fulfilled if Easter were kept on the Sunday following the Jewish Passover. Indeed,

---

[1] Ibid.

Sozomen says that when the time came for Sabbatius to observe Easter according to his own reckoning, "he passed the Saturday [i.e., the Sabbath], from the evening to the appointed time, in watching and offering up the prescribed prayers; and on the following day he assembled with the multitude and partook of the mysteries," a report which is consistent with the understanding that he kept a vigil on the "Holy Saturday" in the week of the Jewish Unleavened Bread, and then attended church on Sunday--an ordinary Sunday to other Christians, but "Easter Sunday" to him.

Valesius,[1] whose Greek text of Socrates, and notes, are published in the Migne collection, judges, however, that the text is corrupt at this point and must be emended in such a way as to make it plain that Sabbatius kept the Passover on the day on which it fell.

But further light is provided by Socrates and Sozomen. Sabbatius did not originate the views that go by his name but adopted them from a schismatic group of Novatian bishops in Phrygia who, in the time of Valens, had "framed a canon" appointing the observance of Easter "on the same day as that on which the Jews annually keep the feast of Unleavened Bread."[2] This statement would settle the question if the Greek were as precise as the English, but the Greek is simply ὥστε Ἰουδαίους ἐπιτηρεῖν ποιοῦντας τὰ ἄζυμα, καὶ σὺν αὐτοῖς τὴν τοῦ Πάσχα ἐπιτελεῖν ἑορτήν,[3] which may mean only that these Novatians elected to keep the Passover "with the Jews" rather than "with the rest of the church," and only to the extent of following the old-fashioned reckoning of having it fall within the week of Unleavened Bread, rather than arbitrarily after the spring equinox. The text says nothing about observing Easter "on the same day" as the Jews. A more satisfactory translation would say, "during the same time" that the Jews were keeping Unleavened Bread--that is, at some point within that week.

---

[1] MPG, vol. LXVII, cols. 623-26.

[2] Socrates EH iv. 28; NPNF (2), II, 112-113;

[3] Hussey's text here equals MPG.

Sozomen's parallel account--"they determined upon keeping the feast of Unleavened Bread, and upon celebrating the Passover on the same days as the Jews"[1]--would likewise settle the matter, if, again, the Greek were as plain as the English. But the Greek says, ὥστε τὴν τῶν Ἀζύμων ἐπιτηρεῖν ἑορτὴν, καὶ σὺν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τὸ Πάσχα ἐπιτελεῖν, a statement which does not use the word "days" at all, and which like the other, can be interpreted as simply placing Easter within the days of Unleavened Bread.

But there is yet another statement by Sozomen:

> The Novatians observe the day of the resurrection. They follow the custom of the Jews and the Quartodecimani, except when the fourteenth day of the moon falls upon the first day of the week, in which case they celebrate the feast so many days after the Jews, as there are intervening days between the fourteenth day of the moon and the following Lord's day.[2]

This translation is filled with difficulties. Sozomen has just urged that all the Novatians, excepting only the members of the recent schism, have always kept Easter with the church catholic. Apparently, then, the term "Novatians" here, does not mean the Novatian church as a whole but only the new schismatic portion of it. And what is to be made of the statement that they "follow the custom of the Jews and the Quartodecimani, except when the fourteenth day of the moon falls" on a Sunday, in which case "they celebrate the feast so many days after the Jews, as there are intervening days between the fourteenth" and the following Sunday? If this is really what the passage means, would it not have been simpler to say that when the fourteenth falls on a Sunday, they keep the following Sunday? Why the strange circumlocation, "they celebrate the feast so many days after the Jews, as there are intervening days," and so on? And if these people keep any given day of the week on which the Passover falls (excepting when it falls on a Sunday, when they choose the following Sunday), what does Sozomen mean by saying that they "observe the day of the resurrection," which is obviously Sunday?

---

[1] Sozomen EH vi. 24; NPNF (2), II, 361. Bidez' text here equals MPG.

[2] Sozomen EH vii. 18; NPNF (2), II, 388-89.

The crux of the problem lies in the word "except." It is apparently taken from three Greek words, πλἢν εἰ μή. Migne's Latin translates at this point, *Nisi quod quoties quartadecima luna non incidit*, etc., making the passage read,

> The Novatians observe the day of the resurrection. They follow the custom of the Jews and the Quartodecimani, except that if the fourteenth day of the moon *does not fall* on the first day of the week,

they keep the following Sunday.

This makes much better sense, and if it is the correct meaning, says simply that the Sabbatians were not Quartodecimans at all, but were observers of the primitive practice of the church in observing Easter on the Sunday that fell next after the Jewish Passover.

The Antiochene Protopaschites.--If it has been decided that the Sabbatians were not a variety of the Quartodecimans, and that they did not hold rigidly to the actual day of the Jewish Passover, the next question to be answered is, Are the Protopaschites whom Chrysostom attacks in his third sermon to be identified with the Sabbatians (who are also called Protopaschites)?

There is at least one similarity between them; like the Sabbatians, they were not Quartodecimans. The classical Quartodecimans concluded their fast on Nisan 14,[1] whereas the Protopaschites in Antioch fasted from Nisan 15 to the 22nd.[2]

Gerhardt Rauschen[3] disagrees at this point. Indeed, he dismisses the whole problem of the identity of the Antiochene Protopaschites as no problem at all. The Easter-day in question is, he affirms, Nisan 14; from which it follows as a matter of course, he says, that the Antiochene Protopaschites are Quartodecimans. It is all as simple as that.[4]

But it is not. The people to whom Chrysostom is speaking are anxious to keep the very Passover day on which Christ was crucified, a date set by the Jews, a day which can be spoken of as "that Sabbath."[5] Specifically, Chrysostom says that in the year in which his sermon is being preached, "the first day of Unleavened Bread falls on a Sunday."[6] The day on which Christ died, the date the Jews set as the Passover and the first day of Unleavened Bread, a day the Jews call a Sabbath, is not Nisan 14 but, emphatically, Nisan 15. And in

---

[1] Eusebius EH v. 23.

[2] See iii, p. 73, below.

[3] Jahrbücher der Christlichen Kirche unter dem Kaiser Theodosius dem Grossen (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1897), pp. 497-99.

[4] Ambrose Letter xxiii To the Bishops of Aemelia supports this view--if it was written in 386 as the editors of the FCC say it was--since it observes that "next year [that is, in 387] the fourteenth falls on a Lord's Day." But the assignment of the year 386 to this letter may have been an error, in view of the evidence that the fifteenth fell on a Sunday in 387.

[5] iii, pp. 72-73, 68. See below.

[6] iii, p. 73. See below.

387 it was Nisan 15, not Nisan 14, which fell on Sunday, March 21.[1] So the Antiochene Protopaschites were not Quartodecimans at all.

In addition to not being Quartodecimans, these Antiochene Protopaschites shared a second point of similarity with the Sabbatians. They insisted that Easter must fall within the days of Unleavened Bread. In this vital matter and to this extent, they were in agreement indeed, not only with the Sabbatians, but also with all the other early Christians who, in the second century, had kept Easter on the Sunday following the Jewish Passover (and hence within the days of Unleavened Bread).

Furthermore, the Sabbatians, as a variety of the Novatians, were schismatics rather than heretics, and when Chrysostom with a sigh turns his attention to the Protopaschites in Antioch, he complains that their perversity has "drawn us away from our contest with the heretics."[2] The great emphasis of this sermon is the sin of schism rather than the sin of heresy, and the Sabbatian Protopaschites were schismatics, not heretics.

Then were his Protopaschites Sabbatians?

Sabbatius adopted his characteristic views and gave his name to them no earlier than 385, only a year or two at most before this third sermon was delivered. However, as has been shown above,[2] his views did not originate with him; they had been adopted by a schismatic synod of Novatian bishops sometime during the reign of Valens

---

[1] Correspondence with Simon Cohen, Hebrew Union College, Jan. 4, 1965, based on D. Leopold Raab, Universal-Kalender fuer die julianische, gregorianische und juedische, juedisch-julianische und juedisch-gregorianische Zeitrechnung (Budapest, 1887).

[2] See p. 53.

(d. 378), and, hence, quite a number of years prior to 385. In view of the great popularity of Sabbatianism in Phrygia and Galatia, there is nothing to preclude the possibility of its travelling to an imperial center like Antioch and being adopted by a few Christians living there,[1] in the time available before Chrysostom preached this third sermon.

There is, however, evidence to believe that the Antiochene Protopaschites were not Sabbatians, but constituted a distinct group.

For one thing, they were characteristically concerned to keep the precise day of the Passover, not some Sunday close to it as the Sabbatians seem to have been. They appear to have attached special significance to holding the Lord's Supper on "that Sabbath,"[2] that is, on Nisan 15. "If we approach" the Table "_on that day_," they say, we consider ourselves to have celebrated Passover no matter what may be the condition of our hearts.[3] Chrysostom retorts, "If you go forward with an evil conscience even on the Sabbath itself," you fail of Communion,[4] and goes on to explain that it is impossible to keep the very day--that is, a Friday that falls on Nisan 15--on which Christ was crucified.[5] (It is apparent from this that Chrysostom attached more significance to Good Friday than his opponents did.)

Secondly, although the Sabbatians kept Lent prior to Easter, the Protopaschites in Antioch appear not to have done so. If they had kept a Lent that in any way approximated the length of a normative Lent or Quadragesima, their Lent and that of the Church would have overlapped considerably many years. But Chrysostom complains that they spend "the whole time," that is, all of Lent, with a guilty conscience.[1] That they did not keep a pre-Easter Lent is evident also from Chrysostom's complaint that, unlike other Christians who approached the Table at Easter with a conscience purged through fasting, the Protopaschites did not approach the Table with clean consciences. Further, there seems to be no doubt that such fast as they did observe fell after their Easter rather than before, during the entire week of Unleavened Bread.[2]

---

[1] Chrysostom asserts that only a few in Antioch had adopted the view he is opposing. See pp. 54-55.

[2] iii, p. 68.

[3] iii, p. 70.

[4] _Ibid_.

[5] iii, p. 73.

Thirdly, Sozomen[3] says that the Sabbatians kept the week of Unleavened Bread as a feast, whereas these Antiochene Protopaschites kept it as a fast.

Thus we may conclude that the Antiochenes whom the manuscript heading calls "Protopaschites" cannot be positively identified with the Sabbatians, and certainly were not Quartodecimans. They may well have formed, as Chrysostom alleges they do, a very small number of people. It is even possible that Chrysostom does not identify them with any better-known group of schismatics for the simple reason that they did not belong to any such better-known group.

We may say at this point that we have been discussing at least three separate groups of schismatics: The Quartodecimans, who ended their pre-Easter fast and held their Easter celebration on Nisan 14; the Sabbatian Protopaschites, who ended their pre-Easter fast and celebrated Easter on a Sunday during the Jewish week of Unleavened

---

[1] iii, p. 78.

[2] iii, p. 73.

[3] "He kept this feast in anticipation of the Christian Easter." See p. lxx, above.

Bread; and the Antiochene Protopaschites, who celebrated Easter and *began* a week-long fast on Nisan 15.

Other problems.--This third sermon represents other problems in addition to that of trying to identify the Protopaschites to whom the MS heading says it is addressed.

For instance, the sermon is directed to "those who τὰ πρῶτα πάσχα νηστεύειν," a clause which can be rendered quite easily as "those who keep the first Passover fast." Unfortunately such a translation has little meaning. What about the word "first," for instance? It is true that the Jewish Passover, based on the 19-year cycle of Meton, precedes Easter, as determined by the Alexandrian system,[1] more often than it follows it, but it does not by any means always precede it. On an average of once every four years the Passover falls later than Easter, as much as four or five weeks later in fact, so that in these years the Jewish festival must be the "second Passover," rather than the "first."

William Bright[2] speaks of the followers of Sabbatius as "Protopaschites" and then observes that they were "observers of the original Pasch." The use of the word "original," or, perhaps, "primitive," has at least the one advantage of avoiding the contradiction of calling a Pasch based on the Jewish Passover the "first" Pasch in those years when it occurs later than the official Easter.

---

[1] The 19-year cycle formed the basis for the perpetual calendar apparently published by Hillel II in 359, while the Alexandrian canon had been followed in Egypt since long before the Council of Nicaea and had been adopted at Antioch in 342. See above, and Simon Cohen, "Calendar," *UJE*, II, 630-34.

[2] *The Canons of the First Four General Councils* (2nd. ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892), p. 120.

But the phrase, "to keep the primitive Passover fast," also presents its difficulties, since if it is referring to the most primitive Passover, that is, the Jewish Passover, it must be remembered that this was not a fast but a feast, the Feast of Unleavened Bread.[1] The "Seder evening" which marked the beginning of the week involved a lengthy ritual supper, replete with meat and wine along with the unleavened bread, and festive with the presentation of gifts to the children.[2] Chrysostom himself was so well aware that the Jewish Passover was a feast rather than a fast that in Sermon iv he derived an emphatic argument from the observation that "in the days of Unleavened Bread, the Jews were not permitted to observe a fast."[3]

Of course, even though the week of Unleavened Bread was undoubtedly a "feast" to the Jews, it may well have seemed to be a "fast" to the Christians whom Chrysostom is addressing. In the casuistic atmosphere already well developed, in which some Christians believed they were observing Lent only if they confined themselves to dry bread, while others considered themselves pious if they but refrained from any particular form of food, however rich, until the ninth hour of the day,[4] it is not hard to imagine that even the denial of nothing more than yeast bread seemed to constitute a "fast" to some Christians. And indeed, it has already been shown above that Chrysostom's Protopaschites did consider the week of Unleavened Bread to be a fast.

---

[1] See, e.g., Lev. 23:5-6 and Luke 22:1, quoted on pp. 96 and 66.

[2] See, for example, Max Joseph, "Passover (Pesach)," UJE, VIII, 408-10.

[3] See p. 95.

[4] Socrates op. cit. v. 22.

So if, as seems likely, they were keeping the Feast of Unleavened Bread when the Jews did, and thinking of it as a fast, it may be valid to say from the Christian point of view that they were "keeping the primitive Passover Fast."

The ambiguity of the very word πάσχα itself presents significant difficulties. Its great variety of meanings not only provides a challenge to the translator but seems also to have contributed to the local problem that Chrysostom was trying to solve.

In Biblical usage the term sometimes means the celebration on the afternoon and evening of the 14th of Nisan as distinguished from the Feast of Unleavened Bread, which followed this celebration for seven days; at other times it includes both the Passover proper and the week that follows it. Lev. 23:5-6 RSV says,

> In the first month, on the fourteenth day of the month in the evening, is the Lord's passover (πάσχα LXX). And on the fifteenth day of the same month is the feast of unleavened bread to the Lord; seven days you shall eat unleavened bread.

But Luke 22:1 RSV says,

> Now the feast of Unleavened Bread drew near, which is called the Passover (πάσχα).

Further, as is obvious, the connotations of the term to the Jew were very different from what they were to the Christian. The Jewish Passover and the Christian Easter are certainly two different things. Because no single English word can serve adequately, I have attempted to use whatever term fits best, and have usually chosen "Passover" and "the Passover Festival" when the Jewish rite is clearly intended, "Easter," when the Christian, and "the Pasch" or "the Paschal Festival" when both are included together, or the usage is insolubly ambiguous.

A final problem that must be mentioned is involved in

Chrysostom's reply to "the word of wisdom" which he says the Protopaschites used in defending themselves. When they are accused of creating a schism, he says, they retort, "Didn't you formerly keep this same fast yourself?" To which Chrysostom readily concedes, "Yes, we did."[1]

There can be no doubt that these Antiochene Protopaschites were keeping the week of Unleavened Bread as a fast. Does it follow then that the church in Antioch had at one time in the past kept this same week as a fast? If the church there did do so, there seems to be no other record of the practice. In fact, it seems impossible to suppose that Chrysostom can have meant what he seems to admit here. Doubtless all that he is admitting to is the custom of letting the Jews determine the date for the Passover, and then setting Easter on the following Sunday, a practice well known to have been the custom at Antioch prior to 341 as has been mentioned.

But if Chrysostom, whose reputation for accuracy is not too strong at best, can speak so loosely at this point in his sermon, is it valid to suppose that we can construct a definitive picture of his Protopaschites on the basis of his other remarks? Perhaps not.

Thus many of the problems which this sermon raises about the Antiochene Protopaschites should likely be considered as unsolved; though it is probably safe to conclude at least that these people constitute a distinct group and should not be confused with either the Quartodecimans or the Sabbatians.

---

[1] See p. 60.

The Problems of Sequence and Dating

In his introduction to the Sermons *Against the Jews* in Migne,[1] Montfaucon notes that Hoeschel and Fronto Ducaeus publish six of these sermons in the order i, iv-viii, thus agreeing not only with each other but also with the fourteen MSS Montfaucon has seen. Ducaeus, he informs us further, supplies in addition Sermons ii and iii, but in a different volume. Erasmus, he says, follows the sequence of MS Regius 2900, which omits Sermons i-iii and supplies iv-viii in numerical sequence. Savile, he adds, gives iv-viii in numerical order on the basis of three MSS, numbering them 1-5, and follows these with Sermon i in sixth place, iii in seventh place, and ii in eighth place.

After presenting this material, Montfaucon observes,

> Here you see much variety and upsetting of the order, brought about by chance rather than by plan. Indeed it took a great effort for us to dispell that mist; with God's help, however, we believe that we have mastered the place and order of each item.

Montfaucon then proceeds with some confidence to provide the order i-viii found in Migne (and followed in this present translation for the sake of convenience), dating the first three sermons in the fall of 386 and the remainder, with only little hesitation, within a twenty-day period in the fall of 387. Reasons he gives to justify his order and dating will be alluded to at appropriate places below.

There is no doubt that the process of arranging the most probable sequence of these sermons and assigning dates to them is difficult, and that it may be facilitated by attempting to arrange them, as Montfaucon does, into separate groups. When this is done, it soon becomes apparent that Montfaucon is right in saying that Sermon ii followed Sermon i quite closely (Savile and Ducaeus to the contrary, notwithstanding), because it begins by referring to a previous message on the Jewish question which had been preached ten days earlier,[1] and later[2] virtually identifies this earlier message as Sermon i by asking, "Didn't you hear the argument in my earlier sermon which proved clearly that demons inhabit the very souls of the Jews, as well as the places where they gather?"--an argument which was established at length in Sermon i.[3]

---

[1] *MPG*, vol. XLVIII, cols. 839-42.

Similarly, Sermons iv-vii fall into place in a sequence, because each subsequent message reviews some argument or other from the one or ones preceding it. Thus Sermon v[4] harks back to the argument in Sermon iv[5] that the three young men and Daniel did not observe Jewish ceremonies when exiled away from Jerusalem. Sermon vi[6] reviews the series of captivities which are discussed in Sermon v.[7] Sermon vii begins[8] with a reminder that Chrysostom has previously[9] cited the prophets as opposing the performance of Jewish ritual outside of Jerusalem and[10] as resisting any hope that Jerusalem will ever be restored,[11] proving that it was preached later than Sermons iv and v. This evidence, together with the argument that the Jewish sacrifices, priesthood, and royalty can never be revived again,[1] which, in itself, is a fulfillment of a claim made by Chrysostom at the end of Sermon v,[2] proves that Sermon vii follows Sermons iv and v--but not that it follows them immediately. Sermon vi must be placed between v and vii in view of the apology contained in Sermon vi,[3] about the condition of Chrysostom's throat consequent to his delivery of Sermon v.

---

[1] ii, p. 40.

[2] ii, p. 50.

[3] i, p. 27.

[4] v, pp. 108-110.

[5] iv, pp. 93-98.

[6] vi, pp. 170-71.

[7] v, pp. 126-61.

[8] vii, p. 200.

[9] iv, p. 93.

[10] vii, p. 204.

[11] v, p. 156; vi, 179.

In this way two tentative cycles may be established, Sermons i and ii in the first, and Sermons iv-vii in the second. Whether to link the remaining sermons with either of these two cycles, or to leave each one of them standing alone, is not so easily determined. But more on these two sermons in a moment.

It is evident that Sermon i was preached (a) as an interruption in Chrysostom's series against the Anomoeans, and (b) at a time when the Trumpets, Fasts (plural), and Festivals of the Jews were "about to commence." Sermon ii was preached when the Fast (singular) was "at the doors," or, more specifically, ten days after Sermon i and five days before the Fast. Since the Jewish ceremonies here referred to are obviously the rituals of the New Year, and since the use of the singular term "Fast" surely refers to the Day of Atonement on Tishri 10, these two sermons were quite evidently preached in August or September according to the Julian calendar, or a few days before and after Tishri 1 on the Jewish calendar, during some year in the course of Chrysostom's ministry in Antioch.[4]

---

[1] vii, pp. 201, 209-24. [2] v. p. 166. [3] vi, p. 168-69.

[4] That Chrysostom was ordained a priest early in 386 is confirmed from a remark in Sermon xvi. 2 On the Statues, in which he says, "This is the second year that I am discoursing to your Charity." That the series On the Statues was preached during Lent, 387, is well established.

Sermon iv, in its turn, was also preached just before the Jewish Fast (singular)--ten days prior to it, in fact--but cannot have been preached in between Sermons i and ii because Chrysostom explains[1] that when he delivered it he had for some time been avoiding controversial topics and had been frolicking in the meadow of the Bible story. This means that when he preached this sermon he had not recently been preaching against either the Jews or the Anomoeans or anyone else. Sermons v-vii must have followed Sermon iv in fairly quick succession, because the last of them says that the Jews are now in process of pitching their tents for the Feast of Tabernacles, a festival which begins on Tishri 15.[2] Thus Sermons iv-vii appear to have been preached between the first and the fourteenth of Tishri in the fall of some year other than that in which Sermons i and ii were preached.

Now what about Sermon viii? The eighth message begins[3] with the statement that "the Jewish fast is over." Though this might seem to imply that it must have been preached shortly after Sermon vii, as Montfaucon concludes, this does not seem likely to have been the case. Sermon vii was preached when the tents were being pitched, as we just observed; that is, shortly before Tishri 15 but later than the Day of Atonement. If Sermons vii and viii were preached in the same cycle as each other, Sermon viii with its cry, "The Jewish fast is over," must have come prior to Sermon vii rather than subsequent to it.

Indeed, the great loss of backsliders which this sermon laments seems to indicate that it should not be placed in connection with the second cycle of sermons at all, but rather with the first; and for this reason Usener[1] and Rauschen[2] both say that Sermon viii, which quite obviously comes just after a Day of Atonement, must have followed on the heels of Sermons i and ii. The emotional fervor of Sermon viii is similar to that of Sermon i. The subject matter resembles it too; both sermons, for example, deal at length with Deuteronomy 13 and with the use of magic for the healing of the sick.

---

[1] iv, p. 80.

[2] vii, p. 199.

[3] viii, p. 230.

If all of the sermons except the third are now arranged in two cycles, Sermons i, ii, and viii are found to belong in the first, and Sermons iv-vii in the second, and both cycles are seen to have commenced some ten or fifteen days prior to a Day of Atonement and to include one sermon preached after that annual fast was over.

Usener,[3] it should be pointed out, does not place Sermon iv at the beginning of the second cycle. Instead, he insists that it be isolated from the other extant sermons and placed a whole year later than any of them. He feels that because this sermon concentrates on the Day of Atonement and evinces but little concern over the Trumpets and the Feast of Tabernacles, it must have been preached at a time after the worst of the Jewish threat had passed. Usener points out further that at the beginning of Sermon v Chrysostom says that the large audience which has come to hear him has come because of a promise he made to give out "silver tried in the fire." Since no such promise is found in Sermon iv, Usener concludes that our extant Sermon iv is not the one that actually preceded our extant

---

[1] Hermann Usener, Das Weihnachtsfest, kap. I-III (Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen, H. Usener [ed.], part 1; Bonn: Verlag von Max Cohen & Sohn, 1889), pp. 227-39.

[2] Op. cit., pp. 496-502.

[3] Loc. cit.

Sermon v. The sermon which preceded Sermon v, he says, has been lost. He is thus free to place Sermon iv wherever he can justify doing so. Usener presents in addition a third argument based on Chrysostom's first Christmas sermon, but this can be treated best a little later.

Upon examination Usener's argument based on the relative unconcern in Sermon iv for the dangers of Trumpets and Tabernacles is found to be invalid, since none of these sermons is much concerned with these two festivals. Chrysostom's "promise" to give out silver tried in the fire can be regarded, in view of his recognized gift for oratory, as merely a figure of the passing moment. And when, in addition, it is remembered that Sermon v reviews the argument based on the three young men in Sermon iv, there is really no good reason to doubt that Sermon iv is indeed the sermon which preceded Sermon v.

Sermon iii, as usual, requires individual treatment; in this instance, because it deals with spring festivals, the Passover and Easter, rather than with the various Jewish fall fasts and festivals as the other sermons do.

This homily all but locates itself. It says that in the year in which it was preached the Passover was to fall on a Sunday. It is generally agreed that the Sunday-Passover here intended is March 21, 387. The Sermons _On the Statues_ occupied Chrysostom during most of Lent that spring; hence, Sermon iii must have been preached some short time prior to the beginning of Lent in 387.

Montfaucon says that Tillemont places Sermon iii _within_ Lent, 387, and then proves that this conclusion cannot be valid in view of the agitation current at that time over the statues. Montfaucon himself then proceeds to date the sermon in the fall of 386, not long after the delivery of Sermons i and ii. He can do this and still hold that the sermon was preached within the year that the Passover fell on a Sunday because, he says, in the Greek church the ecclesiastical year begins in September.

Montfaucon's chief argument comes from the statement in Chrysostom's first Christmas sermon--the same Christmas sermon alluded to a moment ago--that in the month Gorpiaios "we undertook many long sermons against the Jews, attacking their fasting as improper." Montfaucon dates this sermon December 25, 386, and puts Sermons i and ii prior to it in the fall of 386. But since two sermons cannot be construed as "many," he feels bound to add Sermon iii to round out the quantity. But his very admission that "it seems certain that some of the sermons of which Chrysostom speaks have perished," vitiates his argument. It is probably better to date Sermon iii in the early weeks of 387, somewhat prior to the beginning of Lent, as do Usener, Rauschen,[1] and Schwartz.[2]

This brings us to the question of dates for this entire series of Sermons Against the Jews. Sermon iii has been treated already and placed in January, 387. As for the other sermons, one thing can be settled easily. Sermon vi[3] contains a sentence that begins, "Doubtless all of you are acquainted with and remember the time when certain polluted men and sorcerers in our city took down the statues." Since it is well established that the incident of the statues occurred early in 387, this statement proves that Sermon vi was preached later than the early part of 387. Since it has been established further that

---

[1] Op. cit., pp. 496-502.

[2] E. Schwartz, Christliche und judische Ostertafeln ("Abhandlungen . . . zu göttingen philologische-historische Klasse," new series, vol. VIII, no. 6; Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1905), pp. 169-84.

[3] vi, p. 191.

Sermons iv-vii form a single autumn cycle, it can be concluded readily that all five of these sermons were preached during an autumn subsequent to the spring of 387.

Montfaucon, who is sure that Chrysostom began his Sermons Against the Anomoeans in the fall of 386, places Sermons i-iii in the fall of that year and Sermons iv-viii in the fall of a subsequent year, preferably 387. Usener, on the other hand, presenting a very detailed calendar of events, calls Sermon iii the first sermon and dates it on January 24, 387. Sermons i, ii, and viii he places in the fall of 387, Sermons v-vii he assigns to the fall of 388, meanwhile positing a fourth, lost sermon earlier than these others in this second cycle. Finally Sermon iv, which comes last in his system, he places in the fall of 389. Thus Usener spreads the sermons over three years as against Montfaucon's two.

Decisive to Usener's position on these dates, along with other arguments already cited from him above, are his beliefs (a) that the series Against the Anomoeans was not begun until the fall of 387, (b) that the Christmas sermon which refers to anti-Jewish sermons and which Montfaucon dates in 386 actually fell in 388, and his observation (c) that Sermon iii does not contain certain characteristic phraseology common to the other sermons against the Jews and so cannot have been preached *after* any of them.

In the first sermon against the Anomoeans, as Usener points out, Chrysostom explains that he has postponed taking up a refutation of the doctrines of these people because he has not wanted to drive them out of the church, and that he is now taking up this work because some of the Anomoeans have asked him to. Usener insists that if Chrysostom was ordained a priest early in 386, the six months or so between then and August of the same year can hardly have been a long enough period to be spoken of in this manner. To this it can be replied, of course, that to a man of Chrysostom's temperament, six months may well have seemed a very long time indeed. Usener's claim that the Christmas sermon fell in 388 instead of in 386 is an assertion which he fails to prove. And the absence of certain characteristic phrases from Sermon iii does not prove very much about its place in the series of sermons _Against the Jews_, if only because, properly speaking, it is not a sermon against the Jews. In view of all of this, and also of Schwartz' conscious and respectful rejection of Usener's position as mentioned further below, Usener's calendar of these events may be laid aside as unconvincing.

Rauschen[1] agrees with Usener that Sermon iii was delivered during January, 387, and that Sermons i, ii, and viii belong in the first of two cycles. On the other hand, he locates this first cycle in the fall of 386, and places Sermons iv-vii in the fall of 387, thus coming fairly close to Montfaucon's position. He is sure that Usener is wrong in placing iv in the fall of 389 and locates it instead at the beginning of the second cycle. (He is satisfied that the review of the previous sermon in Sermon v harks back to material in our extant Sermon iv.) He further believes, with Montfaucon, that Chrysostom began his series _Against the Anomoeans_ in 386, and also preached his first Christmas sermon in that year.

Schwartz,[2] too, disagrees with Usener, and in doing so expresses his sincere regret that the latter's recent death has made it impossible for him to present his material to Usener for criticism.

---

[1] _Loc. cit._

[2] _Loc. cit._

Schwartz's position is, in fact, almost identical with those of Montfaucon and Rauschen. Placing the first sermons against the Anomoeans in the fall of 386 and Chrysostom's first Christmas sermon in the winter of that same year, he locates Sermons i and ii in the fall of 386 and Sermons iv-viii in the fall of 387. His only major difference with Montfaucon is in his assigning Sermon iii to January, 387, instead of to the fall of 386, and on this point he is in agreement with Usener and Rauschen.

To substantiate his conclusions, Schwartz provides a detailed schedule for all of Chrysostom's known sermons for the years 386 and 387. He is aware that Chrysostom postponed preaching against the Anomoeans for a time, but he does not believe, as Usener does, that he postponed doing so beyond the fall of his first year as a priest.

Among more recent scholars, Quasten[1] says only that these sermons were preached in the years 386 and 387, and Downey,[2] citing Rauschen as his authority, does the same.

Thus Montfaucon, Rauschen, Schwartz, Quasten, and Downey all agree in placing the sermons within the two years 386 and 387. Only Usener would spread them out over the years 387-389, and his arguments are easily shown to be unsound.

The Footnotes

The principles followed in determining what should and should not be included in the footnotes for the purposes of this translation have been as follows:

1. To provide references to all Scripture quotations and

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, III, 452.

[2] *Op. cit.*, pp. 448-49.

allusions, since Scripture is used by Chrysostom as if it were his ultimate authority.

2. To indicate any noteworthy departures from the Nestle and Rahlfs texts within the footnotes, but to indicate omission of material found in these texts by the use of three dots within the quoted material in the body of the translation.

3. To supply helpful information in regard to items in the sermons which bear directly on Jewish and Christian affairs, but not in regard to mere illustrations, imagery, or incidental arguments unless these are readily available at the moment.

4. To provide pertinent items related to the mechanics of translation and the condition of the text.

SERMON I

DANGERS AHEAD[1]

Judaizers and Anomoeans Need Similar Medicine.

I wanted to give you today what was left of the topic on which I have been preaching to you lately[2] and to show you more clearly how incomprehensible God really is. Last Sunday I presented many significant arguments on this subject, calling in as witnesses Isaiah, David, and Paul. The first of these exclaimed, "Who shall describe His generation?";[3] the second, extolling[4] Him for his incomprehensibility, said, "I praise Thee, for Thou art fearful and wonderful; wonderful are Thy works!",[5] and, "Thy knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is great beyond my comprehension."[6] And Paul, not after canvassing the entire question[7]

---

[1] Eight MSS (incl. V560 and P804) and Savile have, "A sermon preached to the Judaizers and those who observe fasts with them."

[2] From the Biblical passages reviewed below, as well as from other evidence, it is certain that the foregoing sermon here alluded to is Chrysostom's first sermon Against the Anomoeans, MPG, XLVIII, 701-10. See also Quasten, op. cit., III, 451.

[3] Isa. 53:8. See also Sermon vi, p. 184, below.

[4] Lit., "he thanked," ηὐχαρίστει.

[5] Ps. 139:14 RSV (Ps. 138:14 LXX). Cf. Thomson: "I will adore Thee, for thou art awfully wonderful. Thy works are wonderful."

[6] Ps. 139:6 (Ps. 138:6 LXX).

[7] Lit., "the inquiry itself," or, "the very inquiry."

of His being, but after taking up only His providence, or rather,
that small part of His providence which was shown in the call to
the Gentiles, exclaimed as if gazing on the open sea,[1] "O the depth
of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable 20
are His judgments and inscrutable His ways!"[2]

Although these witnesses were sufficient to prove my case,[3]
I was not satisfied with the prophets, or even with the apostles
in addition, but went up into heaven and showed you the choir of
angels singing, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace,
goodwill among men.[4] You[5] heard the seraphim, athrill with wonder,
crying, "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is
full of His glory."[6] And I added the cherubim, calling, "Blessed
be His glory from His place"[7]--three witnesses from below, and three 1
from above,[8] declaring the unapproachableness of His glory.[9]

When the proof became indisputable, there was a burst of applause! The audience grew enthusiastic; the congregation caught fire. And I rejoiced. Not that I myself was being praised, but that my Lord was being glorified. For that applause, that praise, revealed the love for God which exists in your souls. You acted like devoted servants who love their master so well they love anyone who praises him. By the enthusiasm of your applause you showed how much you think of your Lord.[1]

---

[1] Lit., "the vast and open sea," but this is tautological in English.

[2] Rom. 11:33 RSV.

[3] Lit., "through these my demonstration was sufficient."

[4] Luke 2:14 RSV margin. The Greek has εὐδοκία instead of εὐδοκίας as in Nestle.

[5] Omitting πάλιν.

[6] Isa. 6:3 RSV.

[7] Ezek. 3:12.

[8] Cf. I John 5:7.

[9] Cf. I Tim. 6:16 RSV, "Who . . . dwells in unapproachable light," φῶς οἰκῶν ἀπρόσοτον.

Now it was my desire to continue this same contest[2] today; for if the enemies of truth never get their fill of blaspheming their Benefactor, how much more should we be unceasing in our praise to the God of the universe? But what can I do?[3] Another malady, a most severe one, summons my tongue for its treatment, a disease which has infected the body of the church. It is necessary to root this out first, and after that to think about the outsiders; first to heal the members of the household and then to care for the others.

What, then, is this disease?

The continuous and successive festivals of those wretched and miserable Jews--Trumpets, Tabernacles, and the fasts[4]--are about to begin, and of those who belong to us and say they are loyal Christians,[1] many are accustomed to attend the places where the festivals are held, and others, even to partake of the feasts and share in the fasts. This wicked practice I now desire to expel from the church.

---

[1] Or, more literally, "For just as devoted servants, on hearing someone praise their master, burn with love for the speaker by reason of their affection for their master, so also did you then; by the excess of your applause you demonstrated how highly you regard your Lord."

[2] Lit., "to wrestle with these struggles," ἐπαγωνίσασθαι τοῖς παλαίσμασι τούτοις.

[3] Greek, ἀλλὰ τί πάθω;

[4] Trumpets announced the Jewish New Year on the first of Tishri. The Fast of Gedaliah and especially the Day of Atonement, or Yom Kippur, were observed on the third and tenth days of Tishri respectively as annual fasts. The Feast of Tabernacles, a joyous festival, ran from the fifteenth to the twenty-second of Tishri.

Sermons against the Anomoeans can be given at a later time and no harm will arise from the delay; but unless I attend to those who are diseased with Judaism at once, when the Jewish festivals are "near, at the very gates,"[2] I am concerned that some will be led by deplorable habit and gross ignorance to share the transgressions of the Jews, and that sermons on these matters preached after the event will be of no value to you. For if, as a result of hearing nothing today, they observe the fasts with the Jews--after they have consummated the sin, it will be useless to administer preventive medicine.

So I am hurrying to anticipate it, just as doctors do who treat the most urgent and acute diseases first.

But then, this contest is related to the earlier one after all, for the wickedness of the Jews is related to that of the Anomoeans,[3] and consequently, my present contest is related to the former one. For the Jews make the very same accusation that the Anomoeans do. And what is this? That "He called God His own

---

[1] Greek, τὰ ἡμέτερα φρονεῖν.

[2] Matt. 24:33 RSV.

[3] Lit., "The things of wickedness are related to the Anomoeans and to the Jews." The Anomoeans were the extreme Arians of the fourth century, and received their name from the doctrine that the Son was totally unlike (ἀνόμοιος) the Father. Their leaders were Aetius and Bunomius. "Anomoeans," ODC, p. 58.

Father, making Himself equal with God."[1] They both make this charge. Or rather they do not actually make it; rather, they obliterate it together with its meaning, if not with their hands, at least with their minds.

Why the Jews Are to Be Considered Wretched

Sec. 2 Now don't be surprised that I called the Jews wretched. Surely anyone is wretched and miserable who has such good things come down from heaven into his hands and then spurns and rejects them so vehemently. The Sun of Righteousness[2] rose early[3] upon them, but they spurned its rays and sat in darkness;[4] whereas we who were brought up in darkness, welcomed the light to ourselves and were delivered from the darkness of our error. They were branches out of the holy root, but have been broken off;[5] whereas we did not partake of the root yet have borne the fruit of true religion.[6] They read the prophets from their earliest years, then crucified the One who was prophesied; but we did not hear the divine words, yet worshipped the One who had been prophesied. This is why the Jews are wretched; because when others seized and appropriated the good things that were sent to them, they repudiated them.

---

[1] John 5:18.

[2] Mal. 4:2.

[3] Some MSS read, πρὸ ἡμῶν, "before . . . us."

[4] Cf. Isa. 60:1-3.

[5] Rom. 11:16, 17.

[6] Cf. John 15:1-8. The NEB regularly translates εὐσέβεια with "religion." It has "true religion" in II Pet. 1:3.

They who were called to sonship degenerated into[1] a kinship with dogs,[2] but we who were dogs were enabled by the grace of God to reject our former folly and rise to the dignity of sons. What is the evidence? When Christ talked to the Canaanite woman, He said, "It is not fair to take the children's bread and throw it to the dogs,"[3] calling the Jews, children, and the Gentiles, "dogs." But see how the order of things has been reversed since then. The Jews have now become dogs and we, children. "Look out for the dogs," Paul says about them, "look out for the evil-workers, look out for those who mutilate the flesh. For we are the true circumcision."[4]

You have seen how those who once were children became dogs; now would you like to know how we, who once were dogs, became children? "To all who received Him," the Bible says, "He gave power to become children of God."[5]

There is nothing more wretched than people who run altogether contrary to their own salvation! When it was necessary to observe the law, they despised it,[6] and now that the law has been abrogated,[7] they are obstinately eager to keep it. What could be more pitiful than these Jews, who irritate God not only by breaking the law but also by keeping it? This is why the Bible says, "You stiff-necked people, uncircumcized in heart . . . , you always resist[1] the Holy Spirit"[2]--not only by breaking the laws but also by wanting to keep them at the wrong time.

---

[1] Or, "were relegated to." The Greek is ἐξέπεσον.

[2] Or, "a kind of dog." Savile and three MSS (incl. P804) have κυνῶν δυσγένειαν, "the ignobility of dogs."

[3] Matt. 15:26 RSV.

[4] Phil. 3:2-3 RSV.

[5] John 1:12 RSV.

[6] Lit., "trampled on it."

[7] Greek, ἀναπαύω. Lampe.

"Stiff-necked." How appropriately he uses the term "stiff-necked!" For they didn't wear the yoke of Christ, even though it was neither tiresome nor heavy but easy. (For He says, "Learn from Me, for I am gentle and lowly in heart"; "take My yoke upon you, . . . for My yoke is easy, and My burden is light."[3]) But in spite of its easiness, they didn't wear it, because their necks were too stiff. In fact, they didn't merely not wear it; they smashed it to pieces.[4] The Bible says, "Long ago you broke your yoke and burst your bond."[5]

It is not Paul who says this, but the prophet, using yoke and bond as symbols of sovereignty, because when the Jews said, "We have no king but Caesar,"[6] they rejected the lordship of Christ.

You broke the yoke, burst the bond, banished yourself from the kingdom of heaven, and thereby submitted yourself to human rulers.

Pay attention to me. See how precisely their prophet intimates their mulishness. He doesn't say, "You put the yoke aside"; he says, "You broke the yoke"--a fault of frisky, bucking animals resisting control. But how did this "stiffness" come about? By gluttony and drunkenness. Who says so? Moses himself. "When Israel had eaten and was filled and had grown fat," he says, "the one who was loved began to kick."[1] When animals have been fattened by having all they want to eat,[2] they get stubborn and hard to manage, and refuse the yoke, the bridle, and the control of a driver. It was the same way with the Jewish people. Reduced by gluttony and drunkenness to a state of utter depravity, they frisked about and neither accepted Christ's yoke nor "pulled the plow" of His teaching.

---

[1] Savile and one MS add, "for they kept resisting."

[2] Acts 7:51 RSV.

[3] Matt. 11:28.

[4] Lit., "They smashed and broke it."

[5] Cf. Jer. 2:20; 5:5; Ps. 2:3.

[6] John 19:15 RSV.

Another prophet intimates the same thing when he says, "Israel ran about madly like a heifer stung by a gadfly,"[3] and still another calls him "an untrained calf."[4]

When animals are unfit for work they are marked for slaughter, and this is the very thing which the Jews have experienced. By making themselves unfit for work they have become ready for slaughter. This is why Christ said, "As for my enemies, who did not want me to reign over them, bring them here and slay them."[5]

The time when you ought to have fasted, O Jew, was when drunkenness was doing these fearful things to you and gluttony produced wickedness. Not now! For now fasting is out of place and repugnant. Who says so? Isaiah himself, when he states emphatically,[1] "This is not the fast that I chose, says the Lord." Why? Because "you fast for strife and debate, and you strike with your fists those who are under your control."[2] If your fasting was abominable when you were striking your fellow servants, has it become acceptable now that you have murdered your Master? How could it, within reason? It is necessary for a person who is fasting to be restrained, to be subdued, to be humbled--not to be drunk with anger!

---

[1] Deut. 32:15. The LXX has "Jacob" instead of "Israel."

[2] Or, "When they enjoy a well-supplied manger and grow fat."

[3] Hos. 4:16 Thomson. [4] Jer. 31:18 Aquila. [5] Luke 19:27.

But are you still beating your fellow servants? Though once, indeed, they did fast "for strife and debate," they do it now for sensuality and the basest licentiousness. Dancing with naked feet in the market place![3] The pretext may be fasting, but the appearance is drunkenness.[4] Listen to the prophet telling you how to fast. He says, "Sanctify a fast," not, "Display one." "Proclaim a solemn service. Assemble the elders."[5]

These Jews, on the contrary, after collecting troops of effeminates and a big mob of female prostitutes, drag the whole theatre, crowd and actors alike, into the synagogue. *For there is no difference between a theatre and a synagogue*!

I know that some think it is bold of me to say that there is no difference between a theatre and a synagogue, but I think it is bold of them not to agree with me. If I am expressing my own opinion, condemn me; but if I am stating the words of a prophet, then accept the declaration.

---

[1] Lit., "crying with a loud voice." [2] Isa. 58:5, 4.

[3] In both ancient and medieval times dancing among the Jews was primitive and spontaneous rather than esthetic, and was especially engaged in on Tishri 10 and Nisan 15. H. G. Enelow, "Dancing," *JE*, IV, 424-26.

[4] Lit., "of drunkards." [5] Joel 1:14.

Why a Synagogue Is No Better Than a Theatre Sec. 3

I know that many people hold a high regard for the Jews and consider their way of life worthy of respect at the present time. That is why I am hurrying to pull up this fatal notion by the roots. I said that a synagogue is no better than a theatre, and I will produce the evidence from a prophet. (The Jews are not more trustworthy than the prophets!) And what does the prophet say? "You have the face of a harlot. You behave shamelessly with everyone."[1]

A place where a whore stands on display[2] is a whorehouse.

What is more, the synagogue is not only a whorehouse and a theatre; it is also a den of thieves[3] and a haunt of wild animals. For He says, "Your house has become to Me the cave of a hyena."[4] Not the cave of a wild animal merely, but of an unclean wild animal.

Again He says, "I have abandoned My house; I have forsaken My heritage."[5] When God leaves, what hope of salvation is there left? When God leaves, a place becomes a "dwelling place of demons."[1] And yet they will insist that they worship God! Perish the thought! No Jew worships God. Who says so? The Son of God. "If you knew My Father," He says, "you would know Me also; but you do not know Me and neither do you know My Father."[2] What more valid evidence could I produce?

---

[1] Jer. 3:3.

[2] Greek, ἕστηκεν. Five MSS (incl. V560 and P804) have, προέστηκεν.

[3] Cf. Jer. 7:11 and Matt. 21:13.

[4] Apparently a conflation of Jer. 7:11 and Jer. 12:9.

[5] Jer. 12:7. Cf. Matt. 23:38 RSV, "Behold, your house is forsaken and desolate."

If they did not know the Father, if they crucified the Son, if they rejected the aid of the Spirit, what man is there who will not state confidently that the place is a "dwelling place of demons"?[3] God is not worshipped there; not by any means! On the contrary, it is from here on an idol temple.

Yet in spite of all this, some people respect[4] these places as if they were worthy of veneration! I don't say this by guesswork; I learned it by actual experience. Three days ago--believe me; I am not lying--I saw a certain woman who is honorable and free, modest and faithful, being compelled by some repulsive, unfeeling wretch, who is reputed to be a Christian (I wouldn't say that a man who dares to do such things is a true Christian!) to enter the premises of the Hebrews[5] and there offer an oath concerning the matters in dispute between them. And because the woman kept calling for help as she went along, begging for someone to put a stop to this lawless violence[6] since it was not right[1] for a woman who had partaken of the divine Mysteries to go into such a place, I stood erect--blazing with righteous indignation and thoroughly aroused[2]--and forbade her to be dragged any farther towards that lawlessness and rescued her from this wicked abduction. But when I asked her abductor if he were a Christian, and he admitted that he was, I taxed him severely, blaming his thoughtlessness and utter stupidity, repeatedly pointing out that if a man says he worships Christ and then drags someone off to the caves of the Jews, who crucified Christ, he is no better than an ass.[3]

---

[1] Rev. 18:2 RSV.

[2] John 8:19. The Greek is rather free. Cf. RSV, "If you knew Me, you would know My Father also."

[3] Some MSS have, ". . . a demonic dwelling place."

[4] Two MSS have, "some people run." [5] Greek, τὰ τῶν Ἑβραίων.

[6] Montfaucon has, "this unlawfulness."

And I pressed a lengthy lecture on him. I said, for one thing, that it is altogether improper either to swear or to require others to do so, basing my instruction on the divine gospels.[4] And I went on to show that one ought not to impose such a necessity even on an uninitiated person, let alone on a woman who is a faithful church member.[5]

Then after I had removed the erroneous notion from his soul with many long arguments, I asked him why he had passed up the church and was dragging the woman to the councils[6] of the Hebrews; and he replied that many people had told him that oaths made there were more fearful.[1]

---

[1] Greek, θεμιτός.

[2] Lit., "burning."

[3] Lit., "no better disposed than asses."

[4] E.g., Matt. 5:34 RSV, "I say to you, Do not swear at all," used by Chrysostom On the Statues xix. 3.

[5] Lit., "who is faithful and has been initiated."

[6] Greek, συνέδρια.

At this I groaned and burned with anger; but afterwards I began to laugh instead. First, viewing the malice of the devil, and the kind of beliefs he has power to instill in men, I groaned. Then, reflecting on the heedlessness of those who are deceived, I burned with anger. But when I reflected on the nature and extent of the stupidity of those who are deceived, I laughed.

I have told you this incident because your attitude to those who do these things and to those to whom they are done is inhuman and cruel. If you see one of your brothers falling into this kind of sin, you consider the calamity to be his own business and no concern of yours. You think it is a defense to say to those who complain, "Why should I care? What do he and I have in common?"[2] Plain[3] words of the utmost misanthropy and satanic savagery.

---

[1] When taking a "Biblical" or a "Mishnaic" oath, the juror had to hold a Bible or a sacred object and swear by the name of Yahweh, and the judge was required to impress on the juror the sacredness of his oath and to warn him against any ambiguity or mental reservation. See Julius Rappoport, "Oath," JE, IX, 365-367. On the other hand, Chrysostom eschewed all oaths, preaching vehemently against them in most if not all of his sermons On the Statues, and deploring with groans the practice of some Christians who clandestinely made oaths in the church with their hands resting on the holy Table. See especially Statues xv. 4-5. Jewish courts of law (which typically met within a synagogue), are attested as early as 50 BC. Their verdicts enjoyed full legal status in the Empire down to at least AD 398. The fact that a decree issued in 415 forbade Christians to make use of these courts shows that Christians were still using them in Chrysostom's day. See Baron, op. cit., II, 265, 285.

[2] Greek, λόγος, which can mean "concern, interest." Lampe.

[3] Lit., "uttering plainly and clearly." The Greek is φθεγγόμενοι.

What? You are a man, aren't you, and so at least share the same human nature. And even more--if we are to speak of a fellowship of nature--you have one head, that is Christ.[1] How dare you say there is no fellowship between you and your own limbs?[2] How can you confess Christ to be the Head of the Church? For it is the nature of the head to join all the limbs together, to unite them, and to make them pay careful attention to one another. If you have nothing in common with your own limbs, then, perhaps you have nothing in common with your brother, but in that case, you do not possess Christ, the Head, either.

The Jews frighten you as if you were little children, and you don't realize it. By showing young children fearful and ridiculous masks, things that aren't really frightening in themselves but which seem to be such to the immaturity[3] of the children's understanding, many coarse slaves stir up boisterous laughter. The Jews scare those who are less mature among the Christians with the same kind of bogey; for how can what they have be truly fearful when such things are freighted with shame and derision,[4] and belong to those who have given offense, and been dishonored and condemned?

What we have is[5] not like this, but is truly awe-inspiring Sec. 4

---

[1] For the imagery of Christ as the Head of the Church whose members are the organs or limbs (μέλη) of His body, see I Cor. 12:12-21, Eph. 1:22-23; 4:15-16; 5:30-32; Col. 1:18.

[2] Greek, μέλη.

[3] Reading ἀτελές with Savile and some MSS (incl. P804), instead of εὐτελές with Migne. V560 omits col. 848:5 to 849:1.

[4] Greek, γέλως. Lampe.

[5] Lit., "but our things are."

and filled with dread. For where God abides, maintaining the power of life and death, that place is fearful indeed--a place where there are numberless accounts[1] of eternal retributions, of fiery rivers,[2] and the poisonous worm, of unbreakable chains, and "outer darkness."[3] The Jews have no conception of these things at all, but, living for the lower nature, all agog for the here and now, no better disposed than pigs and goats, they live by the rule of debauchery and inordinate gluttony. Only one thing do they understand; to gorge and to get drunk; to be hacked to pieces[4] for the sake of dancers, and to get wounded in brawls over chariot drivers.

Are these things, pray tell, sacred and awesome? Who could say so? Then why do they seem awesome to you?[5] unless someone is going to say that servants who have been rejected and deprived of freedom, and driven from their master's house, are objects of fear to those who are in good standing and can speak with confidence!

---

[1] Greek, λόγοι; less literally, "where we hear again and again," but λόγοι may refer to pictures and books as well as to sermons.

[2] A river of fire which tests the righteousness and wickedness of every man after death and which, in some accounts, punishes the wicked interminably, is a common feature of early Christian apocyrpha. Unbreakable bonds are mentioned in the Second Book of Sibylline Oracles. Worms are spoken of several times in Scripture (e.g., Mark 9:44), and the Apocalypse of Paul has two-headed worms a cubit long, but I have not found any references to poisonous worms. See M. R. James, The Apocryphal New Testament (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1955), pp. 85, 195, 198, 514, 522-23, 542, 547, 564.

[3] Matt. 8:12; 22:13; 25:30.

[4] Or, "to get beaten." The Greek is κατακόπτεσθαι

[5] Migne has "to us." Other MSS (incl. P804) have "to you."

They aren't awesome; they aren't. Just as an inn is less honorable than a royal palace,[1] so a synagogue[2] is a less honorable place than any inn. For a synagogue is not a dwelling-place of robbers and knaves merely, but of demons; indeed, not only the synagogues but the very souls of the Jews are such dwelling-places, and I shall attempt to show you this near the end of the sermon.[3]

Our Duty to the Judaizers

I urge you, therefore, to remember this address especially; for I am not speaking for display or applause,[4] but for the healing of your souls. For what else can concern us when, in spite of the abundance of doctors, some of us are still sick?

The Apostles were twelve in number, and they won the world. The majority of the city is Christian,[5] and yet some still suffer from the disease of Judaism. What sort of plea can we claim who are well? Those who are ill deserve to be blamed, of course; but surely we have not been blameless so long as we have been neglecting them in their disorder, for it would be impossible for them to remain ill if they were enjoying our close attention. And so, having assumed this burden,[1] I now say that each of you must[2] win his brother, whether this means you have to force him, or hit him, or insult him, or simply argue vehemently with him,--do everything you can to get him out of the devil's trap and to rid him of his friendship with the Christ-killers.

---

[1] The Greek is plural for both "inn" and palace."

[2] Some MSS have "the site of that synagogue." P804 has "that site of the synagogue."

[3] See p. 27, below.

[4] Some MSS have, "we are not saying what we are saying for display or for the sake of applause."

[5] Several MSS (incl. V560 and P804) have, "they won the majority of the Christians in the city." For the proportion of Christians to the total population of Antioch, see the Introduction, pp. xxxviii-xlii.

Tell me now; if you saw someone down town[3] being led away even[4] after being condemned justly, and if you had power to release him from the executioner's hands, wouldn't you do everything you could to do so? As it is, you see your own brother being dragged away to the pit of destruction, not by an executioner but by the devil, unjustly and profanely, and will you fail to put in a word for him,[5] to rescue him from this wrong?

What kind of mercy will you find?

But he is stronger and more powerful than you, is he? Then bring him to me. If he is stubborn and will not change his ways, I will lose my head before I will let him go on setting foot[6] in the holy portals of the church. "What do you have in common," I will say to him,[1] "with the free[2] Jerusalem above?[3] You have chosen the one that is below; be a slave along with her, for she 'is in slavery with her children'[4] according to the instruction of the apostle. Do you fast with the Jews? Then take off your sandals and go barefoot in the market place as the Jews do, and share their ludicrous indecorum.[5] But this you would never do, for you are ashamed and blush. Then you are ashamed to share their indecorum, are you, but not ashamed to share in their wickedness? What kind of mercy will you find for being a Christian by halves?"

---

[1] Or, "anticipating." The Greek is προλαβών. Chrysostom closes the sermon with another appeal like the one that he gives here.

[2] Taking ἵνα with a subjunctive after λέγω to be imperatival.

[3] Lit., "in the market place/forum."

[4] Added in translation to complete the sense.

[5] V560 and P804 have συμβουλὴν . . . ὑπομένεις. Migne has συμβολὴν . . . ὑπομένοις. Montfaucon has συμβουλὴν . . . ὑπομένῃς. The text appears to be corrupt.

[6] Translating a present infinitive, ἐπιβαίνειν. V560 has ἐπιβῆναι, "to set foot on."

Believe me, I will lose my head before I will neglect those who have this kind of disease. If I see him, that is. If I am ignorant, God, of course, will be merciful. Let each of you come to the same conclusion and not consider this matter inconsequential.

Haven't you noticed what the deacon always[6] cries out in the Mysteries, "Come to know one another"?[7] How he entrusts you with a

---

[1] Added in translation to clarify the sense.

[2] V560 and P804 have ". . . in common with freedom and with the Jerusalem above."

[3] Cf. Gal. 4:26 RSV, "the Jerusalem above is free."

[4] Cf. Gal. 4:25 RSV, "the present Jerusalem . . . is in slavery with her children."

[5] Or, "their indecorum and their laughter." Cf. Michal's disgust at David's dancing (II Sam. 6:16).

[6] Greek, συνεχῶς, lit., "continually." But he seems to have done it only once in each celebration. See the following note.

[7] Greek, ἐπιγινώσκετε ἀλλήλους. Lampe gives "Greet [one another]" as the translation of ἀλλήλους ἐπίγνωτε in the "Liturgy of St. James," but this does not seem to convey the sense here. As F. E. Brightman traces the development of the liturgy in his *Liturgies Eastern and*

strict examination of your brothers? This, then, is what you must do for the Judaizers: whenever you notice anyone Judaizing, restrain him, and do it plainly, so you will not share his danger. Even in army camps,[1] if anyone is detected upholding the Persians and speak- 60
ing their tongue in the presence of the soldiers, he is not the only one who is in danger, but so also is everyone else who observes him and fails to report him to the commanding officer.

You, of course, are the army of Christ; so search with great care, make a painstaking investigation, and see if any aliens have 1
insinuated themselves among you.[2] Make it plain to any you find that we are not doing this to put them to death as commanders do, or to punish or penalize them, but to free them from their wicked error and make them wholly ours. But if you won't do this and knowingly conceal what you have seen, be well assured that you will get the same

---

Western (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1896), this expression came to be substituted for ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλήματι ἁγίῳ, "Greet one another with a holy kiss. Baur (op. cit., I, 192) translates the phrase as "Be reconciled with one another!" Ἐπιγινώσκω seems to be a word whose many shades of meaning cannot be encompassed by any one English word. In any event, Baur (idem) says that the deacon uttered this cry near the beginning of the celebration of the eucharist: "As soon as the catechumens and public penitents had left the church, the deacons drew back the great curtains by which the altar was concealed. All the faithful fell upon their knees. The deacon called out: 'Let us all pray together!' and then he spoke the prayer for the faithful. At the conclusion of this the people answered: 'O God, have mercy on me and save me!' Then everyone stood up. The deacon called out: 'Be reconciled with one another!' The bishop gave the priests and deacons the kiss of peace with the prayer: 'Peace be with you!' Each one answered: 'And with thy spirit.' Then the faithful embraced and kissed with the same greeting."

[1] Lit., "the outside army camps," apparently contrasting the imperial camps with the church. See below.

[2] Cf. Ezra 10:11 RSV, "Separate yourselves from the peoples of the land and from the foreign wives."

punishment that he will. Paul does not consign to retributive vengeance only those who actually commit immorality but also those who approve such people.[1] The prophet, too, assigns the same penalty to thieves and to those who concur with them.[2] And this is as it should be; for the accessory to the fact, the man who knows a criminal but protects and covers up for him, promotes his irresponsibility and helps him commit his crimes with greater impunity.

But it is necessary to return to those who are ill. Sec. 5

Consider, then, with whom it is that those who fast now are participating. It is with those who cry, "Crucify Him, crucify Him",[3] and with those who say, "His blood be on us and on our chil- 20
dren!"[4]

If someone was caught attempting a revolution and was condemned for it, would you dare to go and talk to him? I doubt it. Then if some people are so careful to avoid anyone who has wronged a man, how can it be reasonable for others to make partners of those who have outraged God Himself--for people who worship the Crucified to share festivals with those who crucified Him? It can't be. It is utterly foolish and inane.

---

[1] Rom. 1:32 RSV, "Though they knew God's decree that those who do such things deserve to die, they not only do them but approve those who practice them." Συνευδοκοῦντας αὐτοῖς is common to the Greek text and to Romans.

[2] Cf. Isa. 1:23, 25 RSV, "Your princes are rebels and companions of thieves. . . . I will turn my hand against you," and Ps. 50: 18, 21 RSV, "If you see a thief, you are a friend of his; . . . but now I rebuke you" (though this latter citation is not from a "prophet").

[3] John 19:6 RSV.

[4] Matt. 27:25 RSV.

Holy Books Do Not Make the Synagogue Holy

Since there are some who go so far as to consider the synagogue to be sacred, a few things must be said to them also.

Why do you reverence that place when you ought to thoroughly despise it, and stay away from it?

"The Law is kept there," you say, "and the prophetic books."[1]

Is this really significant? Is it true that where such books are kept, the place, too, is holy? It doesn't necessarily follow.[2] Indeed, I hate and avoid the synagogue most of all for the very reason that, although they have the prophets, they don't believe them, and because, though they read the documents,[3] they don't accept their evidence, which makes their outrage all the worse.

Tell me; if you saw some famous man, respected and distinguished, being taken off into a tavern or a criminals' hangout[4] and insulted there, beaten, and made to undergo fierce drunken behaviour, would you honor that place because a great and illustrious man had stood there and been abused?[5] I doubt it. Wouldn't you rather hate and shun it all the more for this very reason?

Apply this now to the synagogue. The Jews took both Moses and the prophets in there, not to honor them, but to outrage and dishonor them. When they say that these holy men neither knew Christ nor said anything about His Advent, how much worse could they insult them? For when they accuse them of not recognizing their Lord,[1] they make them partners in their own iniquity. The Jews act so offensively against these holy men that we must hate them and their synagogue all the more.

---

[1] Some MSS (incl. P804) have "the books of the prophets."

[2] Greek, οὐ πάντως. [3] Greek, τὰ γράμματα. Liddell and Scott.

[4] Lit., "den of thieves."

[5] More lit., "had stood there as the butt of drunken behaviour."

But why am I talking about books and places? In times of persecution executioners seize the persons of the martyrs and torture and scourge them. Are their hands therefore holy, because they have held the bodies of holy men? Of course not! Then if hands which have held the bodies of holy men remain profane because they held them for an evil purpose, do people who hold the documents of holy men--but who outrage these documents no less than executioners outrage the bodies of the martyrs--become worthy of reverence on this account? How foolish even to suggest it! If bodies which are seized with criminal intent, far from sanctifying those who hold them, actually increase their pollution, how much more true is it that books are of no avail to those who read them without believing them?

The fact is, that this holding of the books for such a purpose makes the Jews all the more wicked. They would not be so guilty if they didn't possess the prophets; and they wouldn't be so unclean and wicked if they didn't read them. But they have deprived themselves of all hope of mercy because, possessing the heralds of the truth, they have rebelled against both them and the truth. They are the more profane and accursed because, possessing the prophets as they do, they have consulted them with an antagonistic spirit.

---

[1] On the basis of one MS (but P804 gives the same reading), Savile reads, "For when they declare such things about them, they denounce them as if they did not know their Lord, and dare to say they share in their own iniquity."

I urge you, therefore, strictly to avoid[1] their assemblies. Not slight is the harm done to our weaker brothers; not slight is the instigation to foolishness among them. For when they see you, who worship the Christ whom the Jews crucified, pursuing Jewish concerns and exalting them, what is to keep them from thinking that everything they have done is as it should have been, and that what we have is of no value at all--when you who represent and attend to these things run to those who try to demolish them?

"If anyone sees you," the Bible says, "a man of knowledge, at table in an idol?'s temple, might he not be encouraged, if his conscience is weak, to eat food offered to idols?"[2] And I say, "If anyone sees you, a man of knowledge, going off into a synagogue to watch the trumpets, might he not be encouraged, if his conscience is weak, to adore Jewish practices?" A man who falls is not punished alone for his own fall but is chastised as well for causing others to fall. Similarly, the man who stands firm is not only crowned for his valor but is honored besides for inspiring others with the same spirit.

So stay away from their meetings and shun all Jewish places. Let no one revere the synagogue for the books it contains, but rather hate and avoid it because the Jews keep [the books of] the holy men only to insult them, because they disbelieve their words,[1] and because they accuse them of extreme impiety.

---

[1] Lit., "to flee and shun." Some MSS have, "to flee and escape."

[2] I Cor. 8:10 RSV.

Sec. 6 But to help you learn that the books do not sanctify the place, and that, on the other hand, the wrong attitude of those who gather there defiles it, I will tell you a little ancient history. When Ptolemy Philadelphus, who collected books from everywhere, had heard that among the Jews there were certain philosophical writings about God and about a most excellent way of life, he sent 50 for men from Judaea and commissioned them to translate the books for him. When they were finished, he placed their translation in the Temple of Serapis (since he was a pagan), and there the books of the prophets remain to this day.[2] Now, is the Temple of Serapis holy on account of these books?

God forbid! While the books do indeed possess a sanctity of their own, they do not impart it to the place where they are stored, because of the pollution of those who gather there.

Now, apply this to the synagogue. Even if there isn't any idol standing there, demons inhabit the place just the same. I say 1 this not only about the synagogue in Antioch[1] but also about the one in Daphne. The pit of destruction there, the one they call "Matrona's,"[2] is even more pernicious, for I have heard that many of the Faith (may I never call them faithful!) go up and keep watch[3] beside it. To me the Synagogue of Matrona is equally profane with the Temple of Apollo.[4] If anyone condemns my boldness, I will condemn his fatuity in return. Tell me, if demons inhabit a place, isn't it godless, even if no wooden image is set up there?

---

[1] Montfaucon (with V560 and P804) has ἐκεῖ for ἐκείνων, changing the sentence to, "because they do not believe the words there."

[2] The Letter of Aristeas (1-11, 317) asserts that it was Demetrius Phalerum, the king's librarian, who made the original suggestion about a translation; that Ptolemy Philadelphus followed up this idea by sending an embassy (including Aristeas) to the High Priest Eleazar for translators; and that when the job was done, Ptolemy ordered the books to be guarded with appropriate care. Tertullian (Apology xviii) says the books were available to the public in the libraries in the Serapeum, while Epiphanius (On Weights and Measures iii-xi) says they were kept in the Bruchium library. The Serapeum library lasted until the destruction of the Temple of Serapis in AD 391, or perhaps until the invasion of Omar in

---

AD 640. Of course, it is the general opinion today that only the Pentateuch was translated in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and, in view of the quality of its Greek, even this much cannot have been made under that king's aegis. See H. St. J. Thackeray (trans.), *The Letter of Aristeas* ("Translations of Early Documents; Series II, Hellenistic-Jewish Tests," W. O. E. Oesterley and G. H. Box [eds.], London: S. P. C. K., 1917), and H. B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1900), pp. 12-13.

[1] Lit., "here."

[2] Chrysostom makes another reference to the synagogue in Daphne, using this same name, in his Sermon iii *On Titus*, "What can be said about those who observe the same fasts with the Jews, who keep the sabbath, and who attend the places which the Jews have consecrated? I speak of the site in Daphne called the cave of Matrona, and of the place in Cilicia called 'Saturn's.'" Aimè Puech (*St. John Chrysostome et les moeurs de son temps*. [Paris: Librairie Hachette et Cie., 1891], p. 187, n. 2) laments that Chrysostom does not express himself more precisely. Matrona was a common appellation for Juno, and the Latin translation in Migne provides a note alleging that this name for the synagogue has something to do with the cult of Juno in Daphne. Daphne, however, is certainly much more famous for its cult of Apollo and Diana (Daphne) than for a cult of Juno. Malalas refers to the synagogue in Daphne as having been burned in a riot on July 9, 507. See Downey, *op. cit.*, pp. 68, 82-86.

[3] Greek, παρακαθεύδω. Liddell and Scott. The reference may be to sleeping in the hope of experiencing a vision.

[4] There had been a Temple of Apollo in Daphne since the days of the early Seleucids. Rebuilt and adorned by Diocletian, it suffered

Where the Christ-killers collect, where the Cross is rejected, where God is blasphemed, where the Father is unknown, where the Son is outraged, where the grace of the Spirit is disdained, and where, besides, real demons are present, is not the mischief much greater? For in the Temple of Apollo the godlessness is open and obvious and can scarcely seduce or deceive a thoughtful, sober person. But here, with their claims to worship God and spurn idols, to possess the prophets and honor them, the Jews prepare quantities of bait and entrap the naive and senseless unawares. So the impiety[1] of the Jews is equal to that of the Greeks, and the deception they achieve is far worse. For in their midst[2] stands an altar of deception, invisible, on which they offer not sheep and calves, but the souls of men.

In short, if you esteem the ways of the Jews,[3] what do you have in common with us? For if theirs[4] are hallowed and mighty, ours are false; and if ours are true, as indeed they are, theirs are full

---

the loss of columns under the first Christian emperors, and after Julian ordered the relics of St. Babylas removed from its vicinity in order to restore the voice of its oracle, it was burned, together with its colossal statue of the god, on October 22, 362, whether by Christians, lightning, or the careless use of candles, even pagan contemporaries found it hard to decide. Walls and pillars of the structure were, however, still standing at least twenty years later. Downey, *op. cit.*, pp. 327, 388. See p. 388, notes 43 and 44 for literature. Chrysostom's concern over an already ruined temple may be explained by the continued existence of several temples in Antioch (*ibid.*, p. 395) and by the continued virility of paganism during the recent reign of Valens (365-378), as attested by Theodoret *EH* iv. 24; v. 21.

[1] Lit., "the things of impiety."

[2] Savile (with V560 and P804) has, "among these."

[3] Greek, τὰ ἐκεινῶν.

[4] Greek, τὰ Ἰουδαίων.

of deceit. I am not referring to the Scriptures, of course. No, indeed, for they led me to Christ. But I am referring to their mad godlessness of this present time.

Proof that Demons Inhabit the Jews

But it is now time to prove that demons do dwell there;[1] and not in the specific building alone, but in the very souls of the Jews as well.

"When an unclean spirit," the Bible says, "has gone out, he passes through waterless places seeking rest; but if he finds none, he says, 'I will return to my house.' And when he comes he finds it empty, swept, and put in order. Then he goes and brings with him seven other spirits more evil than himself, and they enter into it. And the last state of that man will be worse than the first. So shall it be with this generation."[2]

Do you see that demons inhabit their souls, and that the demons today are worse than they were in the past? Certainly, and this is what you would expect. For whereas the Jews once profaned the prophets, they now insult the Lord of the prophets.

Tell me, can you really join in the same activity with men who are demon-possessed, who have so many unclean spirits, who are nourished on slaughters and murders--and not shudder? Is it fitting to exchange greetings with them, to pass even a single word, and not rather to repudiate them as the common corruption and bane of the whole world? Didn't they accomplish every kind of evil? Didn't all the prophets devote many long messages to condemning them?

---

[1] He promised to do this earlier in this sermon. See p. 16, above.

[2] The Greek seems to be a conflation of Matt. 12:43-45 with Luke 11:24-26, with some variations. The translation is adapted from the RSV.

What tragedy, what kind of wickedness, did they not outstrip 60
in their bloodlust? They sacrificed their sons and daughters to demons, disregarding nature, forgetting the pangs of birth, disdaining the rearing of children, completely overturning the laws of kinship,[1] and becoming more savage than all the wild beasts. Wild ani- 1
mals often lay down their lives, disregarding their own safety in order to protect their young; but the Jews, without any necessity whatever, slaughtered their progeny with their own hands to serve the accursed demons, who are enemies of our life.[2]

Which of these might strike a person most with abhorrence--their godlessness, or their savagery and inhumanity? That they sacrificed their children or that they sacrificed to demons? Yet
besides this, in their licentiousness did they not eclipse even the 10
most lecherous animals? Hear what the prophet says about their immorality: "They were lusty stallions, each neighing for his neighbor's wife."[3] He doesn't say simply that "each one coveted his neighbor's wife"; but he uses the animal's cry to describe most expressively their innate sexual mania.[4]

Objections Answered

What more do you want me to mention? Their robberies? Sec. 7

---

[1] Lit., "they overturned the laws of kinship from their bases," as if the laws had been inscribed on stelae. Cf. Ps. 106:37.

[2] Greek, ζωή.

[3] Jer. 5:8.

[4] A free translation.

Their greediness? Their betrayal of the poor? Their thefts? Their shady deals?[1] Why, not even the whole day would be long enough.

"But their feasts have something about them that is great and sacred, don't they?"

No! The Jews have made their very feasts unclean. Hear how the prophets, or rather, hear how God, rejects them vehemently: "I hate, I despise your feasts."[2]

God hates them, and will you share them?

He does not say He hates this or that feast. He hates all of the feasts together.

Would you like to be shown that He hates the service of kettledrums, and lyres, and psalteries, and other musical instruments? "Take away from Me," He says, "the noise of your songs; to the melody of your harps I will not listen."[3] God says, "Take them away from Me,"[4] and will you go and hear the trumpets?

"But surely the sacrifices and offerings themselves are not abominable?"

"If you bring Me the finest wheaten flour," He says, "it will be in vain; incense is an abomination to Me."[5] Can the incense be an abomination and the place not be abominable? And when was it abominable? Before they committed their capital offense? Before they killed their Lord? Before the Cross? Before the abomination of the Christ-killing? And not now much more so?

---

[1] V560 and P804, unlike Migne, divide the first part of this paragraph into short independent questions very much as done here.

[2] Amos 5:21 RSV.

[3] Amos 5:23 RSV.

[4] V560 and P804 omit, "from me."

[5] Isa. 1:13.

"Yet what is more fragrant than incense?"

This is how God evaluates offerings: by examining not the nature of the gifts but the disposition of those who bring them. He noticed Abel before He noticed Abel's gifts. He looked at Cain before He rejected Cain's sacrifices. "For Cain," the Bible says, "and his offering He had no regard."[1] Noah offered God sheep and calves and birds, and Scripture says, "The Lord smelled the pleasing odor";[2] that is, He accepted what Noah offered. (God has no nostrils, of course, for He is incorporeal.) He accepted it, even though there is no smell worse than the odors that arose from those offerings, the smoke of bodies being burned! The Bible calls the smoky smell "an odor of fragrance," and--when the attitude of those who burn it is full of bad odors--He calls incense "an abomination," to help you see that God accepts or rejects sacrifices on the basis of[3] the disposition of those who offer them.

Would you like to learn that, along with the offerings, and the musical instruments, and the feasts, and the incense God rejected the temple itself on account of those who entered there?

He showed it especially by His actions, when he surrendered the temple to the barbarians and later razed it to the ground. He showed it also, before the catastrophe, when He plead through the prophets, "Do not trust in deceptive words that will not profit you, saying, 'This is the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord.'"[1] The temple does not sanctify those who gather there, but those who gather there sanctify the temple. So if the temple was of no avail when the cherubim and the ark still existed,[2] how much less use is it when all these things have been destroyed, and God's rejection is complete, and the reason for hostility is greater?

---

[1] Gen. 4:5 RSV. [2] Gen. 8:21 RSV.

[3] Lit., "by turning attention to." [4] The Greek is plural.

How foolish, how inane, it is to make festival partners out of these people, disgraced as they are, abandoned by God, a people who provoked their Lord? If someone had killed your son, tell me, could you stand the sight of him or the sound of his greeting? Wouldn't you try to get away from him as if he were an evil demon, as if he were the devil himself? The Jews killed the Son of your Master, and will you have the hardihood to engage in an activity with them? The One who was slain so honored you as to make you His[3] brother and fellow heir, and will you so dishonor Him as to respect and cultivate

---

[1] Jer. 7:4. Chrysostom quotes Jer. 7:11 on p. 10, above; Jer. 7:16 in Sermon viii, p. 254; and Jer. 7:21 in Sermon vii, p. 211, below.

[2] It may be significant that Chrysostom does not refer to the golden lampstand and the table of shewbread as being nonexistent in his day. Josephus (War vii. 5. 5) says that these items of furniture were carried by Titus to Rome. They may have continued to exist there until Gaiseric sacked the city in 455, and may even have been seen in Constantinople in 534, though it is also possible that they were thrown into the Tiber in 312. See W. F. Stin[illegible]pring, "Jerusalem Temple," IDB, IV, 559. The ark and cherubim were, of course, permanently lost when Nebuchadnezzar destroyed the temple in 586 BC. No attempt to construct a replacement ark is recorded in Scripture, and Tacitus (Histories v. 9) attests that the Most Holy Place of the second temple was empty.

[3] V560 and P804 omit, "His."

His murderers, the men who crucified Him, by taking part in their festivals? Will you enter their unhallowed precincts, and set foot on their unclean porches, and partake of the tables of demons?[1]--for so I am persuaded to call the Jewish fast since the God-killing; for how can those[2] who work directly against God not be serving demons?

But perhaps you are looking for some helpful service from the demons in return?[3]

When Christ allowed demons to enter swine, they drowned the pigs at once in the sea;[4] will they have any more consideration for human bodies today?[5] Would indeed they did not kill, nor even plot against us! They drove man out of paradise and robbed him of his heavenly honor, and will they be of service to the body? What a stupid fiction! Demons know how to conspire, how to wreak great harm, not how to be of service. They do not spare the soul; tell me, do you think they will spare the body?[6] They try to exile men from their homelands; will they choose to deliver us from our diseases?[7]

---

[1] The Greek, τραπέζης δαιμονίων, is from I Cor. 10:21, "You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons. You cannot partake of the table of the Lord and the table of demons." RSV.

[2] Reading οἱ with P804 rather than ὁ with Migne.

[3] Lit., "But do you seek service from demons?"

[4] Matt. 8:32.

[5] "Today" is not in the Greek but is added here to strengthen the sense of the future tense of the verb.

[6] The Greek is plural.

[7] Or, "They try to expel us from the Kingdom."

Have you not heard the prophets, or rather God through the prophets, say that they can do neither good nor evil?[1] Even if they were able to be of service and wanted to be (which is impossible), you still ought not to exchange an incorruptible and eternal loss for a small and corrupted gain. Will you serve your body in order to destroy your soul? Your bargain is no good. Will you anger God, the Maker of the body, and call your enemy to your aid?

What is to keep some superstitious pagan, merely through his skill in medicine, from leading you rashly to worship the gods?[2] For indeed the pagans[3] have often driven away diseases through their knowledge of healing, and restored their patients to health. But is one to participate in wickedness on this account? God forbid!

Listen to what Moses says to the Jews: "If a prophet arises among you, a dreamer of a dream, and gives a sign or wonder, and the sign or wonder which he tells you come to pass, and if he speaks to you and says, 'Let us go after other gods' which our[4] fathers did not know, 'and let us serve them,' you shall not listen to the voice of the prophet or to the dreamer of the dream."[5] What he is saying is this, If any prophet arises and works a sign--raises the dead, cures a leper, heals a disabled man--and after performing the miracle invites you to engage in godlessness, do not be seduced by that fulfillment of his sign. And why? "For the Lord your God is testing you, to see whether you love Him with all your heart and with all your soul."[1]

---

[1] Cf. Isa. 41:23 RSV, addressing the idols, "do good, or do harm, that we may be dismayed and terrified." Or Jer. 10:5 RSV, "Their idols . . . cannot do evil, neither is it in them to do good."

[2] Following the reading in some of the MSS, Migne is ambiguous and can be translated either this way or as, "What is to keep a man who is superstitious . . . from leading you rashly to worship the gods of the Greeks?" The translation given above seems to provide a clearer antecedent for the pronoun "they" in the following sentence.

[3] Lit., "they."

[4] V560 and P804 read, "your."

[5] Deut. 13:1-3 (13:2-4 LXX). Seems to have been quoted by memory.

It is clear from this that demons do not heal. But when by God's permission pagans[2] actually do succeed in a treatment, as does happen, it is not because God is ignorant of it. His concession is intended to test you, to advance your education--not to make you satisfied with the service of demons![3]

And why am I discussing merely[4] the healing of the body? If anyone should go so far as to[4] threaten you with Gehenna unless you deny Christ, do not listen to him; or if he should promise you a kingdom if you will turn away from God's only Son, reject and hate him. Become a pupil of Paul's and cherish the great words of this noble and blessed soul: "For I am sure," he said, "that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor anything else in all creation, will be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord."[1]

---

[1] Deut. 13:3 (13:4 LXX). Chrysostom quotes Deut. 13:1-3 again when he returns to this same line of reasoning in Sermon viii, p. 249, below.

[2] Lit., "they." The reference may be to demons.

[3] Or, "not that you should put up with demons even when they heal."

[4] "Merely," and "go so far as to," are added in translation to clarify the sense.

Neither angels nor powers, neither things present, nor things to come, nor anything else in creation separated[2] Paul from the love of Christ, and will you let healing of the body separate you?[3] What kind of mercy will we find? Truly, Christ must be for us more feared than Gehenna and more desired than a kingdom.

If we fall ill, we had better remain diseased than for the sake of release from illness fall into godlessness. For even if a demon ever healed, it did more harm than good. It helped the inferior, small thing, the part that in any case will soon die and turn putrid; but it harmed the immortal soul. Just as kidnappers often entice little children with dried fruit and cakes and knucklebone dice[4] and other such things, and then rob them of their freedom or even their very lives, so the demons, promising to heal the organs of the body, annihilate the health of the soul.

Let us not rest content, beloved, but in every way seek deliverance from wickedness. Could not Job have blasphemed God when tempted by his wife, and found release from the calamity that was inflicted on him? "Curse God, and die," she said.[5] But he preferred to suffer pain and waste away and endure the unendurable plague rather than be freed by blasphemy from the evils imposed upon him. You must emulate this man. Even if the demon promises you a thousand ways to get release from the evils that are laid on you, don't listen to him. Like righteous Job refusing to obey his wife, choose manfully to remain diseased rather than lose your faith and the salvation of your soul.

---

[1] Rom. 8:38, 39.

[2] The Greek is in the present tense.

[3] Lit., "and does healing of the body separate you?"

[4] Or, less literally, "with candy, cake, and toys."

[5] Job 2:9 RSV. Lit., "Speak a word against the Lord and die."

God is not forsaking you[1] when, as often happens, He permits you to be ill; instead, He wishes to make you more glorious. Carry on bravely, therefore, so that you may hear the words God said to Job: "Do you think that I am speaking to you for any other reason than to make you appear righteous?"[2]

An Appeal for Decision and Action

Although there is more that I might have said, yet, so your Sec. 8 memory of what has been said may not be affected, I shall bring this sermon to a close by quoting the statement of Moses, "I call heaven and earth to witness against you"[3] that if any of you who are present, or of those who are absent, proceed to the spectacle of the trumpets, or enter a synagogue, or attend the activities at Matrona's, or participate in a fast, or share a sabbath, or observe any other Jewish custom great or small, I shall be "clean from the blood of all of you."[4]

---

[1] Greek, ἐγκαταλείπω. Cf. Heb. 13:5 RSV, "I will never fail you nor forsake you."

[2] Job 40:8.

[3] Deut. 30:19.

[4] Cf. Paul in Acts 20:26, "I am innocent of the blood of all of you."

These words will stand you and me in good stead[1] in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ. If you heed them, they will give you great courage; but if you are heedless and disobedient, if you conceal any of those who dare to do these things, they will rise up like terrible accusers against you.

"I have not shrunk from declaring to you the whole counsel of God."[2] I have deposited the money in the bank. It is now for you to make it grow, to make all the use you can of this address for the salvation of your fellow Christians.[3]

"But it is offensive and disagreeable," you say, "to report those who commit sins like these."

On the contrary, it is offensive and disagreeable to keep silent, for this very silence stirs up God's hostility against both those who escape notice and you who conceal them, and brings on your destruction. How much better it is to irritate your fellow servants for the sake of their salvation than to provoke the Lord against yourselves. Even if your fellow servant gets annoyed, he will not be able to hurt you; on the contrary, he will actually thank you later for his healing. But if you are silent and conniving, obligingly doing your fellow servant an injurious favor, God will require of you the ultimate penalty. So if you keep still, you will stir God to hostility against yourself and hurt your brother, but if you report him and bring him out into the open, God will be gracious to you, and you will win a passionately devoted friend who has learned of your well-doing by experience.

---

[1] Or, "will stand at the side of you and me as an advocate."

[2] Acts 20:27.

[3] Lit., "your brothers."

Don't suppose you will be doing your brothers a favor if you fail to expose them sternly when you see them doing any of these unseemly things.

If you lose a cloak, don't you look at both the thief and the person who knows him but doesn't report him, as equally hostile? The Mother of us all has lost not a cloak but a son.[1] The devil stole him and holds him now in Judaism. You know the thief. You know who was stolen. You see me, beating my breast, lighting the word of instruction like a lamp, and searching everywhere. And will you stand silent and not speak out?

What kind of mercy will you find? What is to keep the church from counting you among the worst of its enemies, hostile and destructive? God forbid that anyone who has heard this message will ever so sin as to betray a brother for whom Christ died![2] Christ shed His blood for him, and are you not man enough[3] to speak a word for him?

Come now! I urge you, immediately on leaving here, to expedite this manhunt. Each of you, bring me one of these sick folk. Or rather (for God forbid that there should be that many), let groups of two or three of you, or of ten and twenty, bring me one each. And then on that day, as I see this prey caught in the nets, I shall set the table for you the more bountifully. For if I see that today's message has been carried out, I shall embrace the cure of these folk with greater enthusiasm, and the gain to both you and them will be greater.

---

[1] Lit., "a brother"; that is, a church member.

[2] The Greek for "a brother for whom Christ died," seems to be a conflation of I Cor. 8:11 and Rom. 14:15.

[3] Lit., "do you not endure?"

So don't take this matter lightly, but let women go to work for women, and men for men, and slaves for slaves, and freemen for freemen, and children for children; in a word, let all of you, with every diligence, hunt out those who have this disease. And when you have done so, come to the next meeting to receive my praise and, above my eulogies, to attract the unspeakably great reward which comes from God and which exceeds, in abundant measure, the toils of those who achieve success.

May all of us obtain this reward, by the grace and loving-kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom and with whom be glory to the Father, together with the Holy Spirit, now and always, for ever and ever, Amen.

SERMON II

ALL OR NOTHING[1]

Why the First Sermon Was Preached So Early

Well, that unlawful and unclean Fast of the Jews is "at the doors."[2]

Don't be amazed that I called it "unclean," even though it is a fast. Anything that happens against God's will, even a sacrifice or a fast, is as polluted as anything can be.

Their unlawful fast is set for five days from now. I anticipated it ten days ago or more, you remember, when I brought you a message urging you to make your fellow Christians[3] secure. Don't let anyone condemn that sermon as premature because I preached it so far ahead. When a fever is expected, or some other malady, we try to forestall it by conditioning the body of the prospective victim with a series of treatments. We work quickly to save the person from the approaching discomfort before it strikes. And I, too, because I saw a most dangerous disease on its way, issued a warning in advance, in fact a long time in advance, so that appropriate measures could be taken[1] before it hit.

---

[1] The heading in Migne is, "To those who keep the Jewish fast, and to the Jews themselves; preached five days before their fast, and subsequent to another sermon previously presented." The sermon "previously presented" is identified as the first one in the present series by an allusion to it on p. 50, below.

[2] Matt. 24:33.

[3] Lit., "your brothers."

The reason I didn't wait and bring this message during the actual days of the fast was so that lack of time wouldn't keep you from searching out your brothers. I wanted you to have plenty of time at your disposal, an adequate opportunity to seek out those who have this affliction and win them back. People who celebrate weddings and hold lavish dinners do the same. They don't make arrangements with the fisherman and bird hunters while the meal is in progress but a long time in advance, that nothing may be missing from the table merely from a lack of time to supply it.[2]

And so, because we are about to set a table for you[3] in opposition to the obtuseness of the Jews, we talked to you fishermen ahead of time so you could "dragnet" your weaker brothers and bring them to hear our sermons. Those of you who have gone fishing and have already caught some fish in your nets, must continue to hold them securely in the net with words of admonition. Those of you who have not yet bagged some of this excellent game, still have time to do so in the five days that remain.

So let us spread out the nets of instruction. Let us form a circle, like hunting dogs, and drive them together from everywhere into the laws of the church. Let us set on them, if you please, like that master huntsman, the blessed Paul, who cries out and says, "Now

---

[1] Savile supplies the infinitive, γίνεσθαι, implied by ὥστε, but not present in the text.

[2] Lit., "so that no hindrance to the furnishing of the table may arise from the shortness of time."

[3] Lit., "in front of you."

I, Paul, say to you that if you receive circumcision, Christ will be of no advantage to you."[1] Many wild animals, or animals that have gone wild, hiding it may be in a thicket, spring up in alarm at the shout of a hunter, and are herded together by the urgency of his voice, and are often driven into the traps[2] against their will, by virtue of the clamor. The same is true of your brothers who are hiding in the thicket of Judaism. When they hear Paul's cry, I am very sure they will readily fall into the net of salvation and give up all their Jewish errors. For it is not Paul who speaks these words, but the Christ who stirs his soul. When you hear him announce, "I, Paul, say to you that if you receive circumcision, Christ will be of no advantage to you," you should take only the voice to be Paul's. The message[3] that rings through it is Christ's.

With Law and Grace, It Is All or Nothing

But someone perhaps will object, "Is the harm of circumcision really so great as to vitiate entirely the dispensation of Christ?"

Indeed it is! Circumcision is this serious--though not on account of its intrinsic nature, but because of a lack of understanding about it. There was a time when the law was useful--even necessary. Today, however, it is null and void. If you invoke it now, when it is no longer in effect,[4] of course it nullifies God's gift to you; Christ can be of no advantage to you, for the reason that you do not wish to come to Him.[1]

---

[1] Gal. 5:2 RSV, quoted also in Sermon viii, p. 248, below.

[2] Lit., "into the very traps," perhaps the meaning, "the very traps they are trying to avoid."

[3] Translating two words in the Greek, νόημα, δόγμα.

[4] Translating ἀκαίρως as, "when it is no longer in effect."

Suppose someone were in prison after being arrested for adultery and highly disgraceful behaviour, and a trial was about to be commenced and a verdict of condemnation passed against him. Then suppose a royal order were to arrive pardoning all the inmates of the prison without accounting or examination, and that this man, not wishing to enjoy the free gift, obstinately chose to go to law and submit to examination and questioning--would he still be able to derive any benefit from the king's grace? No, for in making himself liable to a court and a trial and a verdict, he would voluntarily have disqualified himself from the royal boon.

And this is what has happened to the Jews.

Look! All mankind had been taken in the most shameful sins (since "all have sinned"[2]), and were being "kept under restraint"[3] by the curse of transgression. The sentence was about to be passed against them when a royal message came from heaven, or rather, the King Himself came, and released all the prisoners from the chains of sin without examination or the necessity of a trial. All who Sec. 2
have run to Christ[4] are now enjoying the free gift and are being

---

[1] The words "to Him" are not in the Greek. [2] Rom. 3:23 RSV.

[3] Gal. 3:23 RSV. The Greek is similar to Nestle, but Nestle says men were confined under the law, rather than under the curse of the transgression.

[4] The meaning seems to be that, as soon as the King arrived, the chains were undone to let the prisoners run out to hear Him deliver His proclamation of grace; some prisoners, however, refused to leave their cells.

saved by grace. But those who wish to be justified by law[1] will "fall from grace."[2] By insisting on being saved by their own resources, they will be unable to benefit from the King's benevolence; further, they will draw upon themselves the "curse of the law,"[3] "for no human being will be justified . . . by works of the law."[4] And this is why Paul says, "If you receive circumcision, Christ will be of no advantage to you," for the person who perversely insists on being saved by the works of the law has nothing in common with grace.

Paul expresses this very thing also in a riddle. "If it is by grace," he says, "it is no longer on the basis of works; otherwise 50 grace would no longer be grace. But if it is by works, it is no longer on the basis of grace; otherwise work would no longer be work."[5] And again, "For if justification were through the law, then Christ died to no purpose."[6] And still again, "You who would be justified by the law; you have fallen away from grace."[7]

---

[1] Cf. Gal. 4:21 ("you who desire to be under [ὑπό] law") and 5:4 ("you who would be justified by [ἐν] the law"). The text here has ἀπὸ νόμου, but Paul never uses ἀπό in the expression "to be justified by law," preferring ἐκ and ἐν.

[2] Cf. Gal. 5:4 RSV, "You who would be justified by the law; you have fallen away from grace." The Greek verb, ἐκπίπτω, can mean both "fall from" and "be expelled from," and the latter may be the significance Chrysostom intends here.

[3] Gal. 3:23 RSV.

[4] Rom. 3:20 RSV.

[5] The first sentence of this quotation is from Rom. 11:6 RSV. The second sentence is found in TR.

[6] Gal. 2:21 RSV.

[7] Gal. 5:4 RSV. Chrysostom quotes this verse again in Sermon vi, p. 195, and in Sermon viii, p. 248, below.

You have died to the law![1] Don't you understand?[2] You are dead! You are under the yoke[3] no longer, nor under its compulsion! Then why do you insist without rhyme or reason,[4] on making trouble for yourself?

Now, why does Paul insert his name into his statement, instead 1
of saying simply, "I say to you"? Because he wants to remind them of
the enthusiasm which he had once shown for Judaism. "For if I were
a Gentile," he implies, "and were inexperienced in Jewish concerns,
a person could perhaps have said that I exclude the Jewish way of
life from the church's teachings because I have had no part in it
and am consequently ignorant of what circumcision can do." So he
inserted his name to remind them of what he had done for the law in 10
the past. He is saying in effect, "I am not doing this through any
hatred of circumcision, but rather because I have come to know the
truth. I, Paul, say this; the Paul who was circumcized on the eighth
day, a man of Israel, a Hebrew of the Hebrews, a member of the tribe
of Benjamin, in relation to the law a Pharisee, in respect to zeal a
persecutor of the church[5] who entered houses and dragged off men and
women and committed them to prison[6]--which ought to convince even the

---

[1] Cf. Gal. 2:19 RSV, "I . . . died to the law."

[2] This question has been added in the translation.

[3] Cf. Gal. 5:1 RSV, "Do not submit again to a yoke of slavery."

[4] Lit., "to no end and in vain."

[5] Phil. 3:5-6, quoted freely..

[6] Acts 8:3, quoted freely. Cf. also Acts 22:4; 26:10.

dullest person that it was not through any hostility to Jewish affairs or ignorance about them that I have laid down this rule, but through coming to know the surpassing truth of Christ."

Going on, Paul says, "I testify again to every man who receives circumcision that he is bound to fulfill the whole law."[1] Why doesn't he say, "I direct," or "I command," or "I speak," instead of saying, "I testify"? To remind us, by means of this verb, of the judgment to come; for witnesses imply a court and a verdict. He instills fear in his audience, reminding them of the royal throne and making it clear that these words will be his witnesses in the day when every man shall give an account for everything he has done and said and heard. The Galatians heard this once upon a time, and those who have the Galatian sickness today must hear it now. If such people are not present at this meeting,[2] then let them hear Paul declaring through you: "I testify to every man who receives circumcision that he is bound to fulfill the whole law."

Don't let anyone tell me that circumcision is just one commandment! This "one commandment" imposes on you the entire yoke of the law. Whenever you lead yourself into the despotism of the law by keeping any part of it, you are required to obey when it commands all the rest. And if you fail to keep all of it, you necessarily become subject to retribution and draw upon yourself its curse. Like a sparrow that falls into a trap, even if only one foot gets caught, all the rest of its body is caught as well. In the same way, if a person keeps only one commandment of the law, like circumcision or fasting, by means of this one commandment he surrenders to the law his entire freedom. And as long as he wishes to obey it in this one particular, he is quite unable to escape.

---

[1] Gal. 5:3.

[2] The words, "at this meeting," have been added in the translation.

The Law Was Useful Once, But It Has Been Superseded 50

We are not saying this to condemn the law--far from it!--but to point up the surpassing riches of the grace of Christ. The law is not opposed to Christ! How could something that was given by Him and that leads us to Him be opposed to Him? But we are compelled to say these things by the inopportune perversity of those who want to keep it at the wrong time. These are the people who outrage the law: those who order others to have done with it once and for all and to turn to Christ instead--and who then keep holding on to it!

I, too, agree--I would never deny--that at one time the law
was very profitable to our nature. But you who cling to it after its 60
appointed time has run out are not allowing the real greatness of
this value to be seen. A person entrusted with the care of a child[1]
can have no greater commendation than for his young charge no longer
to need his guidance in order to behave. Likewise, it is the great- 1
est commendation of the law that we no longer need its help.

This, in fact, is what the law actually has done for us; it has made our souls more apt to receive the greater philosophy. The person who pores over the law and is unable to see anything greater in it than what has been written there, has failed to get very much out of it. But I, who have abandoned it and run toward the more exalted doctrine of Christ, can praise it best, because it has made me such that I can rise above the smallness of what is written and ascend to the height of the instruction which comes to us from Christ.

---

[1] Greek, παιδαγωγός.

The law has profited our nature very greatly, but only when it has led us genuinely to Christ. When it hasn't, it has actually done damage by depriving us of greater things through an assiduous attention to lesser ones, and by holding us back in the countless ulcers of our sins.

Suppose there were two doctors, the one less effective and the other more so. If, after applying medicine to an ulcer, the first were unable to relieve the patient at once of his pain, . . .[1]

The Christian's Responsibility for a Judaizing Wife — Sec. 3

"[If you are offering your gift at the altar, and there remember that] your brother [has something against you], leave your gift before the altar and go; first be reconciled to your brother, and then come and offer your gift."[2] It doesn't say, "Shorten the sacrifice and then go away," but, "Omit it entirely[3] and go and be reconciled to your brother."

---

[1] There is a lacuna here of indeterminate length. In view of the relative length of this sermon in comparison with the others, this lacuna may amount to a full half of the original sermon.

[2] Matt. 5:23, 24 RSV. Brackets indicate what is lost in the lacuna.

[3] Or, "It doesn't say, 'Speed up/Cut short the sacrifice . . . , but, 'Leave it unfinished. . . .'" The Greek words are σύστειλον and ἄφεις μένειν ἀπλήρωτον.

The Bible says this not only in this connection but also in another as well, where it states that anyone who has an unbelieving wife (that is, one who is a pagan) is not allowed to divorce her. "If anyone has a wife who is an unbeliever," it says, "and she consents to live with him, he may not divorce her."[1] But he is not prevented from divorcing a woman who is a prostitute and an adulteress, for it says that whoever divorces his wife "except on the ground of unchastity, makes her an adulteress";[2] from which it follows that it is lawful to get a divorce on the charge of unfaithfulness.

Do you see how solicitous and kind God is? If your wife is a pagan, He says, don't divorce her; but if she is a harlot, then you may.[3] In other words, if she fails to reverence Me, do not divorce her; but if she insults you, no one will keep you from putting her away.

Since God has treated us with so much respect, shall we regard Him as unworthy of at least equal honor?[4] Shall we be indifferent to the fact that our wives insult Him, even when we know that severe punishment and dire vengeance await those who neglect their wives' salvation?[5] This is why He made you the head of your wife;[6] this is why Paul commands, "If they desire to know anything, let them ask their husbands at home."[1] It is so that you, like a teacher, like a protector or a guardian, may lead your wife into the true religion.[2]

---

[1] I Cor. 7:12.

[2] Matt. 5:32 RSV.

[3] Lit., "I do not prevent your doing so."

[4] The Greek is plural.

[5] Lit., "will be in store for us, when we are negligent of the salvation of our wives."

[6] Cf. I Cor. 11:3.

As it is, when the time for meeting calls you to church, if your wives are indifferent, you don't stimulate them to go; but if they respond with alacrity when the devil calls to the trumpets, you fail to hold them back, but let them get caught in crimes of godlessness and drawn away into immorality. For harlots and effeminates and 1 the whole company of the dancing floor habitually collect there.

But why am I talking about the immorality that goes on there? Are you not afraid that your wife will come away from that place possessed with a demon? Didn't you hear the argument in my earlier sermon[3] which proved clearly that demons inhabit the very souls of the Jews, as well as the places where they gather? Tell me, how do you dare to return to the congregation of the apostles after you have 10 cavorted with demons? After you have gone off and joined those who shed Christ's blood, how can you keep from trembling when you return and eat from this holy Table and drink this precious Blood? Does it not make you shudder? Doesn't such lawlessness appal you with terror? Have you no respect for the Table itself?[4]

I have discussed these things with you; now you discuss them with the others, and they with their wives, and so "build one another up."[5]

---

[1] I Cor. 14:35.

[2] Lit., "may lead her into piety."

[3] See Sermon i, p. 27, above.

[4] Or, "the very Table."

[5] I Thess. 5:11 RSV.

A Sharp Rebuke in Closing

Any catechumen who suffers from this disease is to stay away from the porticoes; any believer, who has been baptized,[1] is to be excluded from the Table.[2] 20

Not all sins require merely advice and counsel; some can be corrected only with an abrupt, sharp cut. Those lesions which are easier to bear are responsive to the milder medicines, while putrid and incurable ones and kinds that spread over the body, require lancets of iron and flame.[3] It is the same way with sins; some need 1
protracted counselling while others need abrupt rebukes. Hence Paul, in his own words, commands us not to resort to counsel in every case but sometimes to deliver a short and sharp reproof. "Therefore," says he, "rebuke them sharply."[4]

So let us do it. Let us rebuke them sharply, that through shame and self-reproach over what has happened they will cease to be contaminated by this unlawful fast. For this reason I now leave off counselling and henceforth testify and declare, "If anyone has no love for the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be accursed.[1]

---

[1] Lit., "initiated."

[2] The Canons of Laodicea (AD 360?) throw light on this injunction. Canon 37 forbids Christians to participate in Jewish feasts or even to receive portions of food sent to them from such Jewish occasions. Canon 38 declares it unlawful for Christians to accept unleavened bread from the Jews. Canon 29 specifies that Christians should not rest on Sabbath but should work on that day and honor the Lord's Day instead, and anathemitizes any who judaize. See H. R. Percival, The Seven Ecumenical Councils, NPNF (2), XIV, 148-151, following the text in Labbe and Cossart, Concilia.

[3] That is, surgery and cautery.

[4] Tit. 1:13 RSV.

What could be a greater demonstration of not loving the Lord than for a person to take part in a festival with those who killed Him!

It is not I who curses such persons. It is Paul; or rather, not Paul either, but Christ, the one who speaks through him and who said a moment ago, "They who would be justified by the law have fallen away from grace."[2]

Tell them these words. Read them these statements. Rescue them with every earnestness. Snatch them out of the devil's teeth.[3] And bring them to me on the day of the fast; so that, with the unfinished engagement by then fully met,[4] we may "together, with one voice, praise the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,"[5] to whom is glory into the ages, Amen.

---

[1] I Cor. 16:22. [2] Cf. Gal. 5:4, quoted on p. 44, above.

[3] Lit., "throat."

[4] Lit., "when you have fulfilled the promise not yet completed." Chrysostom seems to assume that the good will of his audience implies a promise to rescue the Judaizers, exactly as he requests. Some have, indeed, already gone out and caught some of them (p. 41, above), but there is more work to be done.

[5] Rom. 15:6.

SERMON III

PRESS TOGETHER[1]

(Against the Protopaschites)

Another Disease Has Broken Out Among the Flock

Once more a compelling and urgent necessity has arisen to interrupt our current series, draw us away from our contests with the heretics,[2] and take over the sermon for the day.

I was prepared to address your love again on the glory of the Only Begotten, but the unseemly stubborness of those who wish to observe the primitive paschal fast[3] demands that all today's instruction be directed to their treatment.

A good shepherd[4] not only drives the wolves away but also shows every solicitude for any sheep that are ill. Nothing is gained if sheep escape wild animals only to die of disease. In the same way, a competent general, when defending a city, doesn't confine himself to repulsing seige engines, but even before doing this, first reconciles the dissident elements inside the city. He knows that victory over the enemy without will mean nothing so long as civil war continues within.

---

[1] The Migne text gives the heading, "Against Those Who Keep the Primitive Paschal Fast." See the discussion of this sermon in the Introduction, above. The Migne text was collated with "Regius 1963," now catalogued as Paris, Bib. Nat. gr. 656, a MS of the eleventh century.

[2] That is, the Anomoeans, as the topic for discussion indicates. See also Sermon i. p. 1, above.

[3] Lit., "to fast the first Passover," τὰ πρῶτα πάσχα νηστεύειν. See the Introduction, above.

[4] Cf. "I am the good shepherd." John 10:11, 14.

Listen to a saying of Christ's which shows that nothing is more destructive than discord and dissension. "A kingdom divided against itself," He says, "cannot stand."[1] What is stronger than a kingdom whose might is furnished by revenues, weapons, walls, fortifications, a large infantry, cavalry, and other items without number? Yet even power like this is destroyed when it fights against itself; for nothing results in weakness so naturally as internal hostility[2]--just as nothing provides strength and power so much as love and unanimity. Solomon observed the same thing, too, and said, "A brother helped by a brother is like a fortified city and a well-contrived kingdom."[3]

Do you see, then, how great the strength of unity is, and how great, the harm of rivalry?

A kingdom torn with internal strife is destroyed, but two who are in agreement, who are bound closely to each other, are far more solid than a city wall.[4]

Of course, I know that by God's grace the majority of our flock has escaped this ailment, and that the disease has been confined to just a few; nevertheless, therapy must not be neglected on this account. Even if there were only ten, or five, or two,--even if there were only one who was ill, that one ought not to be neglected. Even if there is only one, and he a person of little significance or standing, he is still a brother for whom Christ died,[1] and weighty indeed is Christ's saying about such people: "Whoever causes one of the little ones who believe in Me to sin, it would be better for him to have a great millstone fastened round his neck and to be plunged into the sea."[2] And again, "As you did it not to one of the least of these, you did it not to Me."[3] And, "It is not the will of your[4] Father who is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish."[5]

---

[1] Cf. Matt. 12:26. The quotation seems to be a conflation of this verse with parallel passages, Mark 3:26 and Luke 11:18.

[2] Lit., "strife and dissension."

[3] Lit., "a kingdom made fast with bolts." The LXX has "a well-founded palace." The RSV has, "the bars of a castle." Prov. 18:19, quoted freely.

[4] Or, "than every wall."

How apalling it is for us to neglect the "little ones," when Christ shows such deep concern for them!

Don't say, "It's only one." Say instead, "If only one is neglected, he will transmit his disease to the others." "A little yeast leavens the whole lump."[6] This is what ruins everything, our neglect of little things. This is why small ulcers grow large when, with appropriate attention, large ones readily get small.

---

[1] I Cor. 8:11, not conflated with Rom. 14:15 as in Sermon i, p. 38, above.

[2] Matt. 18:6.

[3] Matt. 25:45.

[4] The RSV prefers "my," but puts "your" in the margin.

[5] Matt. 18:14 RSV.

[6] Gal. 5:9 RSV. The Greek agrees with Nestle in both Gal. 5:9 and I Cor. 5:6. The RSV translates I Cor. 5:6, however, as, "A little leaven ferments the whole lump of dough."

This, then, I say to them first, that there is nothing worse than divisiveness and quarreling, than dividing the Church, than cutting in pieces the robe which even the thieves did not dare to tear.[1] Are the rest of the heresies so inadequate that we must resort to cutting ourselves to pieces? Can't you hear what Paul says? "If you bite and devour one another, take heed that you are not consumed by one another."[2]

Tell me, if you are walking outside the flock, aren't you afraid of the lion who is also going about outside? "For your enemy prowls around like a lion, seeking someone he may seize."[3] Have you noticed the shepherd's good sense? He kept the lion from getting in among the sheep, and in this way prevented them from panicking. But at the same time, He did not drive it away from the outside of the fold, so that, through being afraid of it, the sheep inside would huddle close together. You do not reverence the Father?[4] Then fear the enemy. If you separate yourself from the flock, the lion will surely get you. Christ could have driven the lion away from the outside of the fold, but to help you be self-controlled and strenuous, and to teach you to have constant recourse to your Mother, He has allowed it to keep roaring out there, so that those who are inside, on hearing it, will crowd closer together and take refuge in one another.

---

[1] John 19:23-24. Cf. Cyprian *On Unity* 7, "By the sacrament and sign of His garment, He has declared the unity of the church."

[2] Gal. 5:15 RSV.

[3] I Pet. 5:8, quoted freely.

[4] Or, "You reverence the Father, don't you?"

In the same way affectionate mothers often threaten to throw their whimpering children to the wolves,[1] not with any intention of actually doing so, but to make them stop being a nuisance. Christ did everything for the same purpose, that we should be peaceable and be united to one another.

Paul Regarded Schism as the Most Serious of All Complaints

Sec. 2 For the same reason, when Paul had many serious charges to bring against the Corinthians, he put no indictment ahead of this one. Although he needed to complain about immorality and presumptious pride, about the use of pagan law-courts and about banquets held in idol temples, about the fact that while the women failed to veil their heads, the men veiled theirs, and beside all this, about their disdain[2] for the poor, about the pride springing up among them concerning charismatic gifts, and about the resurrection of the body--needing, I say, along with all these things to rebuke them also for contentious and devisive strife, he passed by all the other matters, to set this one straight first of all.

If you do not find me wearisome, I will make it plain from Paul's own words that though he did indeed have all these things to complain of, he, nevertheless, set none of them straight until he had settled this. That they were fornicating, listen to what he says: "It is actually reported that there is immorality among you."[1] That they were proud and conceited: "Some are arrogant, as though I 50 were not coming to you."[2] That they were using pagan law-courts: "When one of you has a grievance against a brother, does he dare to go to law before the unbelievers?"[3] And that they were eating food that had been offered to idols: "You cannot partake of the table of the Lord and the table of demons."[4]

---

[1] Lit., "into the mouths of wolves." [2] Or, "disregard."

As for the fact that the women were not veiling themselves but the men were, hear how he censures them: "Any man who prays or prophesies with his head covered dishonors his head, but any woman who prays or prophesies with her head unveiled dishonors her head."[5] And that they were being contemptuous of the poor he makes clear when he says, "One is hungry and another is drunk,"[6] and again, "Or do you despise[7] the church of God and humiliate those who have 1 nothing?"[8] That they were all grabbing at the greater gifts with no one wanting a lesser one, he asks, "Are all apostles? Are all prophets?"[9] And that they were disputing about the resurrection: "Someone will ask," he says, "'How are the dead raised? With what kind of body do they come?'"[10]

Yet in spite of having so many complaints of this sort to lodge against them, he says nothing before taking up the matter of their quarrels and divisiveness. Right away, at the very beginning of his letter, he says, "I appeal to you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that all of you agree and that there be no dissensions among you."[1] For he knew, he knew well, that this was the most urgent problem of them all; for if the immoral person keeps coming to church regularly, or the boastful man, or the person with any fault whatever, by taking advantage of regular instruction, he soon discards what is wrong with him and returns to good health; but the man who breaks away from the congregation, the man who withdraws from the instruction of his fathers and runs away from this "doctor's office," even though he seems to be well, falls quickly into disease.

---

[1] I Cor. 5:1 RSV.

[2] I Cor. 4:18 RSV.

[3] I Cor. 6:1. Nestle has ἀπίστων, "unbelievers," instead of ἀδίκων, "unrighteous."

[4] I Cor. 10:21 RSV.

[5] I Cor. 11:4-5 RSV.

[6] I Cor. 11:21 RSV.

[7] Or, "disregard."

[8] I Cor. 11:22 RSV.

[9] I Cor. 12:29 RSV.

[10] I Cor. 15:35 RSV.

Paul does here what the best doctors do. They allay the fever first, then remedy the ulcers and fractures afterwards. Paul does away with the dissension first, then treats the lesions organ by organ. So this is why, before going on to other matters, he first talks with them about not separating into parties and enlisting themselves under the names of particular leaders and tearing Christ's body to shreds.[2]

And he is not saying these things, of course, only to the Corinthians, but also to all those after them who suffer from the same diseases as they had.

---

[1] I Cor. 1:10 RSV.

[2] Cf. I Cor. 1:13 RSV, "Is Christ divided?"

The Ignorant Protopaschites Ignore the Whole World

I should like to ask these Protopaschites,[1] "Just what is the paschal festival? What is Lent?[2] What is Jewish, and what belongs to us? Why does the Jewish Pasch occur only once a year, while ours[3] is celebrated at every meeting? What is the meaning of the unleavened bread?" and a great many other questions on this same subject. In this way you would come to understand how misplaced the obstinacy of these people really is, who, though they are unable to give a reason for what they do, yet (because they are wiser than all men) refuse to learn from others; and you would see how utterly defenseless their position is, who, neither possessing knowledge nor obeying their appointed rulers, with no more ado trust themselves to heedless habit and fall into pits and over precipices.

But what is their wise response when we raise these objections against them? Sec. 3

They say, "Didn't you formerly keep this same fast yourself?"

But this is not for you to say to me, though I could properly ask it of you; for though, indeed, there was a time when we observed it, we have since chosen to prefer harmony to the observance of dates.[4] So the very thing Paul said to the Galatians, I also say to you, "Become as I am, for I also was as you are."[5]

---

[1] Lit., "them."

[2] Greek, τεσσαρακοστή.

[3] That is, the Lord's Supper.

[4] See the Introduction, above.

[5] Gal. 4:12.

Why did Paul say this? He was persuading the Galatians to abandon circumcision and to despise sabbaths, and days, and all the other requirements of the law;[1] then, when he saw how afraid they were that as a result they would suffer the punishment and retribution that is the price of transgression, he presented his own case as an encouragement to them, and added, "Become as I am, for I also was as you are."

"I am not of Gentile extraction, am I?" he asks. "I am not unacquainted with the Jews' legalistic mode of living or with the 1 vengeance that awaits those who break the law, am I? 'A Hebrew of the Hebrews; in respect to the law a Pharisee, concerning zeal a persecutor of the church? . . . Yet all the profit I made, I have accounted loss for Christ's sake.'[2] That is, I have withdrawn from them once and for all. Become then as I am, for I also was as you are."

But why am I talking about myself?[3] Fathers to the number 10 of three hundred, or even more, gathered in the region of Bithynia[4] and ordained these things by law;[1] and here you disrespect them all! For it follows inevitably, when you fail to observe the laws they laid down, that you are doing one of two things: Either you are condemning them as fools who didn't know what they were doing, or as cowards who knew all right, but who played the hypocrite and betrayed the truth. Yet everything that happened shows that they displayed great wisdom and courage.[2] On the one hand, the creed they set forth certainly shows how wise they were, for it silenced the heretics and 20 repulsed all their plots like an impregnable wall; on the other hand, the recent persecution and the warfare against the churches pointed up their bravery. For like gallant heroes who have erected countless trophies and suffered many wounds, the champions who gathered there from the churches everywhere bore the stigmata of Christ[3] and were able to number many punishments endured for confessing Christ. Some could tell of mines and of hardships endured in them; others, of the

---

[1] Greek, τῶν νομίμων ἀπάντων.

[2] Phil. 3:5-7. Cf. the use of this passage in Sermon ii, p. 45, above.

[3] See p. 60, above.

[4] "The exact number of the members of the Council of Nicaea," says Duchesne (op. cit., II, 113), "was not fixed at the outset by official documents. Eusebius of Caesarea, who took part in this assembly, says that there were more than 250; another member of the council, Eustathius of Antioch, speaks of 270, Constantine of more than 300. This last figure is that of St. Athanasius, of Pope Julius, and of Lucifer of Caliaris. In the course of time it was increased a little, to arrive at the symbolic number of 318, which was that of the servants of Abraham in his struggle against the confederate kings,

---

and tradition has so fixed it. The lists which have come down to us only mention 220 names, fourteen of which are the names of chorepiscopi." Among those in the fifth century who used the number 318 are Socrates (EH i. 8) and Theodoret (EH i. 7). Sozomen (EH i. 17) has "about 320."

[1] The Council's decision in regard to Easter is not contained in any of the extant Nicaean canons but in a letter which Constantine sent to the bishops who had not been present and which may be read in Eusebius *Life of Constantine* iii. 18. It says, in part, "It seemed to be unworthy that in celebrating this most sacred feast we should follow the custom of the Jews, who have defiled their hands with a heinous sin. . . . And let the sagacity of your Holinesses consider how enormous and scandalous it is that some should be devoting themselves to fasting on the very same day when others are celebrating banquets."

[2] Or, "manliness."

[3] Cf. Gal. 6:17 RSV, "I bear on my body the marks of Jesus." It is characteristic of Chrysostom to use "Christ" instead of "Jesus."

confiscation of all their property. Some spoke of hunger, or of continuous blows, while others showed their sides that had been torn to ribbons, or their crushed backs, or their gouged-out eyes, or some other part of their bodies that had been mutilated for Christ's sake.[1]

The synod which ordained that the fast should be observed by everyone in the same way was composed entirely of champions of this caliber. Do you think that men who were loyal to the faith in such perilous times were about to play the hypocrite over an observance of days? Beware what you do when you condemn so many Fathers, so stalwart and so wise. If the Pharisee, by condemning a publican,[2] lost every advantage he enjoyed, what mercy will you find, what defense, if you oppose so large a number of teachers who are dear to God, and do it unjustly, and so foolishly?

Have you not heard Christ Himself say, "Where two or three are gathered in My name, there am I in the midst of them"?[3] If Christ is present where two or three are gathered together, how much more was He present among well over three hundred, shaping and ordaining everything that was done! In addition, when you condemn the Fathers, you condemn not them alone but all the world as well, which approved their judgment.

Do you really think the Jews are wiser than the Fathers all over the world--even now, when they have been expelled from their ancestral way of life and have no festivals left to celebrate any more?[1] That's right![2] Unleavened Bread does not pertain to the Jews any more! And neither does the paschal festival. (I even hear many say that Unleavened Bread is associated with Easter.) But to see that Unleavened Bread does not pertain to the Jews any more, listen to the Lawgiver: "You shall not be at liberty to keep the Passover in any ordinary city which the Lord your God gives you, but only in the place in which His name shall be invoked,"[3] referring, of course, 1 to Jerusalem. Do you see how God first restricted the feast to one certain city, and then later destroyed that very city in order to lead them, even against their will, away from that way of life?

---

[1] Eusebius (Life of Constantine iii. 9) refers to their wisdom, endurence, and gravity, but says little about scars and mutilations. Theodoret (EH i. 7), however, gives an account like this.

[2] Luke 18:9-14.

[3] Matt. 18:20, quoted freely.

That God foresaw what the result was going to be is surely plain to everyone. Why, then, did He make them come to Jerusalem from all over the world, if He knew in advance that the city would some day be destroyed? Is it not perfectly clear that He did it from a desire to abolish the festival?

God destroyed it, and will you follow the Jews, about whom 10 the prophet asks, "Who are blind but My servants? And deaf, but those who rule over them?"[4] Who was there to whom they were not inconsiderate and unfeeling? The apostles? The prophets? Their own teachers? And why bring up teachers and prophets when they actually slaughtered their own children? For "they sacrificed their sons and daughters to the demons."[1]

---

[1] Lit., "and do not celebrate any festival at all."

[2] These two words have been added in translation.

[3] Deut. 16:5-6. Cf. the use of this passage in Sermon iv, p. 91, below.

[4] Isa. 42:19.

They failed to respect nature. Tell, were they about to observe days?

They trampled the ties of kinship under foot; they forgot their children; they forgot even God Himself, who made them. "The God who begot you," the Bible says, "you have forsaken, and the God who nourished you, you have forgotten."[2]

They forsook God, and were they going to observe festivals? Who would suggest it?

It is true that Christ kept the Passover with them, but He did not do so in order that we should do the same, but in order to impose the truth upon the shadow. Christ also underwent circumcision, kept sabbaths, celebrated festivals, ate unleavened bread, and, mind you, did all these things in Jerusalem, but this does not mean that we are supposed to do the same, for Paul declares, "If you receive circumcision, Christ will be of no advantage to you."[3] And referring to unleavened bread, "Let us, therefore, celebrate the festival, not with the old leaven, the leaven of malice and evil, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth."[4] Our unleavened bread is not kneaded flour; it is a path of sincerity and a virtuous life.

---

[1] Ps. 106:37 RSV (Ps. 105:37 LXX).

[2] Deut. 32:18.

[3] Gal. 5:2 RSV.

[4] I Cor. 5:8 RSV.

Why Christ Kept the Passover

Then why did Christ do all these things? Sec. 4

The old Pasch was only a type of the one that was coming, and it was necessary for the truth to be imposed upon it; so after displaying the shadow[1] first, Christ later introduced the truth itself on the Table. Now that the truth has been brought in, the shadow is forever eclipsed and its time is up. Don't, therefore, keep alleging what Christ did but show me instead that He commanded us to do the same. In the meantime I will show you that far from commanding us to observe set days, Christ actually released us from any such obligation.

Listen to what Paul says--but when I say Paul, I mean Christ, for it is He who moves Paul's soul. What then does he say? "You observe days, and months, and seasons, and years! I am afraid I have labored over you in vain."[2] Again, "As often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death."[3] When he uses the words, "As often as," he makes the one who approaches the Table the master and frees him from all observance of days.

For the Passover[4] and Lent are not the same thing.[5] Lent comes once a year, but the Passover comes three times a week and sometimes four, or rather, as often as we wish. For the paschal festival is not a fast (like Lent or Unleavened Bread),[1] but is the Supper[2] and the Sacrifice which take place at every meeting. Listen to Paul: "Christ, our paschal lamb, has been crucified for us,"[3] and "As often as you eat this bread, and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death."[4] You celebrate the Passover as often as you present yourself with a clear[5] conscience; not when you fast, but when you partake of the Sacrifice.

---

[1] Cf. Col. 2:16-17 KJV, "Therefore let no one pass judgment on you in questions of food and drink or with regard to a festival or a new moon or a sabbath. These are only a shadow of what is to come; but the substance belongs to Christ."

[2] Gal. 4:10-11 RSV.

[3] I Cor. 11:26. The Greek agrees with P^{46}, the TR, and others in adding τοῦτο after τὸ ποτήριον.

[4] Apparently the term "Passover" includes the week of Unleavened Bread. Cf. Luke 22:1 RSV, "Now the feast of Unleavened Bread drew near, which is called the Passover."

[5] The argument which Chrysostom is answering seems to be, "You

"As often as you eat this bread, and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death."[6] The purpose of the paschal festival is to proclaim the Lord's death. Hence, the Supper that occurs today, and the one that was celebrated yesterday, and the one that takes place on each of the other days, is one and the same with the

---

'orthodox' Christians keep Lent; then why do you complain if we observe Unleavened Bread? One fast is the same as another." Chrysostom says in reply that the correct way for a Christian to observe the Passover is not by keeping a fast--either the "fast" of Unleavened Bread or Lent, but by participating with a pure conscience in the Supper.

[1] The words in parentheses have been added in translation. See p. 66, n. 5, above.

[2] Greek, προσφορά. Cf. p. 70, n. 3, below.

[3] I Cor. 5:7. As compared with Nestle, the Greek agrees with the TR in adding ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν after ἡμῶν.

[4] I Cor. 11:26 RSV. This time the word τοῦτο is omitted. See p. 66, n. 3, above.

[5] Lit., "clean."

[6] This time the Greek again contains τοῦτο. Cf. n. 4, above.

Passover which is offered on that Sabbath.[1] The one on that day is in no way more sacred than this, nor this one, today, more ordinary than that, but all are one and the same, equally awesome and salutary.

Why We Observe Lent

But someone is asking, "Then why do we fast for these forty days?"

It has not always been the case.[2] It used to be that many people approached the Mysteries casually and haphazardly, particularly so at this season when Christ first delivered them to us. But when the Fathers became aware of the harm that came from this careless approach, they met together and ordained that there should be forty days of prayer and fasting, and attendance at meetings, and of listening to sermons. Their goal was that after having been thoroughly purified during these days by prayers, and almsgiving, and fasting, and vigils, and tears, and confession, and everything else, we would approach the Mysteries with a clean conscience, so far as lay in our power. That they succeeded greatly, through this condescension to our weakness, by getting us into a settled habit of fasting, is clear from the result. For if I keep preaching and proclaiming a fast throughout the rest of the year, no one pays any attention to what I say; but when Lent comes round, even the most sluggish person, without anyone's urging or advising him, rouses himself and listens to sermons.[1]

---

[1] The day of the Passover, the first day of Unleavened Bread, is considered among the Jews to be a Sabbath, regardless of the day of the week on which it falls. See, for example, Max Joseph, "Sabbath," *UJE*, IX, 295. In 387 this "Sabbath" fell on March 21, a Sunday. Chrysostom's meaning is probably that a celebration of the Lord's Supper which happens to coincide with the Jewish Passover "Sabbath," is no more sacred than one which takes place on any other day.

[2] This sentence has been added in translation.

So if a Jew or a pagan asks you, "Why do you fast?", don't say, "On account of the Passover," or "On account of the Cross," because by so doing you give him too big a handle. For we don't fast on account of the Passover, or on account of the Cross, but, being about to approach the Mysteries, we fast on account of our sins. Indeed, the paschal festival is not an occasion for fasting or grief, but for happiness and joy.

For the Cross took away sin, purified the world, reconciled long-time opponents, opened the gates of heaven, made friends out of enemies, restored our nature to heaven, set it down on the right hand of the throne, and gave us countless other blessings. Consequently we must not grieve and be downhearted over all this but exult and rejoice. This is why Paul says, "Far be it from me to glory except in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ,"[2] and again, "God shows His love for us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us."[3] John, too, says, "God so loved the world." How, tell me? Passing over everything else, he selects the Cross, and after saying, "God so loved the world," he adds, "that He gave His only Son" to be crucified, "that whoever believes in Him should not perish but have eternal life."[1] If the Cross is an occasion for love and glorying, let us never say that we grieve on its account! We certainly do not mourn on its account--far from it--but on 10 account of our sins.

---

[1] Lit., "to advice and counsel." On another occasion Chrysostom lamented that people did not attend church properly even during Lent. See Baur, op. cit., I, 238.

[2] Gal. 6:14 RSV.

[3] Rom. 5:8 RSV.

So this answers the question about why we fast.

True Communion Depends on the Conscience, Not on the Calendar

Sec. 5 Now the catechumen never celebrates the Passover, even though he joins in the fast each year,[2] for the reason that he does not partake in the Supper.[3] Conversely, the person who does not join in the fast but who approaches the Mysteries with a pure conscience, celebrates the Passover whether he partakes of the Communion today, or tomorrow, or at any time whatever. For the best participating is adjudged "best" on the basis, not of the time observed, but of the purity of our conscience.

20 "But we do the opposite," they say. "We don't cleanse our minds, but if we approach on that day,[4] we consider ourselves to have celebrated the Passover, even if we are filled with innumerable sins."

---

[1] John 3:16 RSV.

[2] Baur (op. cit., I, 81) says that in the fourth century "it was a fairly general custom to enroll the catechumens in two classes; first, those who were making the remote preparation for baptism and who attended only the sermons and catechism classes; and second, those who had passed this course and had been admitted as direct candidates for baptism. The entire time of preparation lasted usually two or three years."

[3] Or, "sacrifice." The Greek is προσφορά. Cf. p. 67, n. 2, above.

[4] That is, on the same day as the Jewish Passover.

But it isn't so. It isn't so. If you go forward with an evil conscience even on the Sabbath itself,[1] you fail of communion and leave without having celebrated the Passover. But if you receive Communion today, or on any other day, with your sins washed away, you celebrate the Passover perfectly.

You ought to observe that precision and strictness of yours not in the observance of a date but in respect to your personal condition as you approach the Mysteries.[2] In the same way that now you would rather suffer anything than change the custom you are used to, so you ought to regard that business as trivial and choose instead to suffer and do anything rather than approach the Table full of sins.

To prove that God takes no account of set seasons and this sort of observance, listen to what He says when He sits in judgment: "You saw me hungry," He says, "and gave Me food. You saw Me thirsty and gave Me drink. You saw Me naked and you clothed Me,"[3] while He condemns those on His left hand for the opposite conduct. Then He brings in a man and punishes him for holding grudges: "You wicked servant! I forgave you all that debt . . . ; and should you not have had mercy on your fellow servant, as I had mercy on you?"[4] He shut those girls out of the wedding hall because they had no oil in their lamps.[5] And He threw a man out for going to a wedding with dirty clothes on instead of a wedding garment; that is, for being clothed with immorality.[1] But for keeping the Passover in such and such a month no one was ever punished, or even apprehended.

---

[1] See p. 68, n. 1, above.

[2] Lit., "but in your approach."

[3] Matt. 25:35, quoted freely.

[4] Matt. 18:32 RSV.

[5] Matt. 25:1-13.

And why do I speak only of ourselves as being free from all
such requirements; of us, whose citizenship is in heaven, where there
are no months, and where there is no sun or moon or annual cycle? 50
For if anyone should care to look into the matter diligently, he
would find that, although the site of Jerusalem is honored indeed,
there is very little said to the Jews either about set times. For
example, some men came to Moses once and said, "We are defiled by a
dead body. Is it possible that we shall have to be late for the 1
Lord's gift?", and Moses replied, "Stand here and let us present
your case to God." Then, after he had presented it he brought back
a law, saying, "If any man is defiled by the dead, or is on a long
journey, and is not able to keep the Passover in the first month, he
shall keep it in the second."[2]

Even among the Jews the time for the observance was relaxed
so the Passover could take place in Jerusalem--and will you, in
order to be regarded as observing dates, refuse to honor the harmony
chosen by the church? Will you insult the common Mother of us all 10
and lay waste the holy Synod? How will you ever deserve mercy, if
you choose to sin like this over a mere nothing?

But then again, why mention the Jews? It is quite impossible to keep the very day on which Christ was crucified anyway, no matter how intense may be our desire or how earnest our efforts to do so. Even if the Jews were not living in transgression, or being unreasonable, and insensitive, and heedless, and disdainful; even if they had not lapsed from the heritage of their fathers, but were carefully keeping it even now, it would still be impossible for us to follow them and employ the very day on which Christ celebrated the Passover and was crucified. How is this so? Let me explain. The day on which He was crucified was the first day of Unleavened Bread. It was also a Friday. These two days simply cannot coincide every year! Take the current year, for example. The first day of Unleavened Bread falls on a Sunday, and in view of the requirement to fast for the whole week, are we to continue fasting even after the Passion has passed, and the Cross has come, and the Resurrection? It has happened this way often: After the Crucifixion, after the Resurrection, because the week of Unleavened Bread is not yet completed, the fast is still being carried on.[1] And so no time is observed at all.

---

[1] Matt. 22:11-13.

[2] Num. 9:7-11. The Greek differs considerably from the LXX, though the quotation of this same passage in Sermon iv, p. 93, below, is much closer to the LXX.

So let's not be stubborn. Let's not say, "I have fasted this way for such a long time; am I to change now?" Do change, and do it for this very reason, that for such a long time you have separated yourself from the church. Come back to your Mother from now on.

No one says, "Because I have been 'enemies' so long, I am ashamed to be 'friends,'" for it is a shame to cling to one's outmoded opinions instead of making a change for the better. This is what destroyed the Jews. By their continual insistence on ancient custom they were drawn away into godlessness.

---

[1] When Easter was observed on the Sunday following the Jewish Passover, as had been the case for many years in Antioch prior to 341, Good Friday and Easter Sunday obviously fell within the week of Unleavened Bread.

But why talk about the observance of fasts and days? Look at Paul.[1] He kept the law a long time. In fact, he worked very hard for it. He went on many journeys[2] and endured all types of hardships. He outstripped all his contemporaries in his precise adherence to the Jewish way of life.[3] But even after driving himself to the very top in Judaism, when he realized that everything he did tended to destruction and death, he changed his ways at once. He didn't say to himself, "What? Am I being penalized for my very enthusiasm? Am I to lose all my labor?" On the contrary, he changed all the quicker, in order to experience such a loss no longer. He despised the righteousness that comes from the law so as to receive the righteousness that comes by faith, and he cried out, "All the profit I made I have accounted loss for Christ's sake."[4] 50

Let Everyone Work for Peace and Unity

1 "If you are offering your gift at the altar," the Bible says, "and there remember that your brother has something against you, . . .

---

[1] This sentence has been added in translation.

[2] Notably his famous journey to Damascus to prosecute nonconformists. Acts 9.

[3] Cf. Gal. 1:14 KJV, "I advanced in Judaism beyond many of my own age among my people, so extremely zealous was I for the traditions of my fathers."

[4] Phil. 3:7. See p. 61, above.

go, first be reconciled to your brother, and then come and offer your gift."[1] What does this mean? If your brother has something against you, God does not allow you to offer your sacrifice until you have become reconciled to him. And here you have the whole Church and all these Fathers against you, and will you have the audacity, the hardihood, to approach the divine Mysteries without first making peace? How can you celebrate the Passover in such a frame of mind?

Remember,[2] I am not saying this only to those who are directly involved, but also to you who are well, so that you will pick out all you see in this condition, and with great care and gentleness, restore them to their Mother. And if they resist, or are supercilious, or make any other response whatever, let us never give up until we have succeeded in persuading them.

For there is nothing equal to peace and harmony.

This is why, when the bishop[3] makes his entry, he doesn't step up to the throne until he has first called down peace upon you all; and when he stands up, he doesn't begin the instruction he has for you until he first gives you peace. The priests also, when they are about to offer the blessing, pray for your peace before they begin. And when the deacon bids you pray, along with the other matters he also directs you in the prayer to ask for the angel of peace and for every peaceful thing that has been set forth.[1] And when he dismisses you after the service he calls down on you the prayer, "Go in peace."[2] In short, it is impossible to say or do anything without peace, for peace is our nurse, and our mother, who cherishes us with every solicitude.

---

[1] Matt. 5:23 RSV, quoted also in Sermon ii, p. 48, above, where the text resumes after the lacuna.

[2] This word has been added in translation.

[3] Lit., "the father."

But, of course, I mean true peace; not that peace that comes from a casual greeting or from eating a meal together.[3] The peace of God. The peace that comes from spiritual harmony. The peace that many are now disrupting by destroying the church over an unseemly quarrel--while they strengthen the synagogue and consider the Jews more dependable teachers than our own Fathers. They trust the Christ-killers to explain Easter![4]

What could be more absurd? Don't you realize that their Passover is a type and ours, the truth? How vast the difference is! The typical Passover prevented ordinary physical death, but the true one removed the wrath which was held against the whole world. The first brought deliverance from Egypt; but the other set men free from idolatry. The one drowned Pharaoh; the other, the devil. After the one came Palestine; after the other, heaven.

---

[1] Or, "he directs you in the prayer to ask the angel of peace for everything appointed in the litany of peace [τὰ εἰρηνικά, Lampe]."

[2] Cf. Chrysostom Sermon iii *On Col.*, "When he who presides over the church comes in, he immediately says, 'Peace unto all'; when he preaches, 'Peace unto all'; when he pronounces the blessing, 'Peace unto all'; when he calls for the greeting, 'Peace unto all'; when the sacrifice is finished, 'Peace unto all'; and again, in the middle, 'Grace to you and peace.'"

[3] Greek, τῆς κοινωνίας τῶν παρεζῶν. It is possible that the reference is to the Lord's Supper.

[4] Lit., "what happens," or, "the experience."

Then why do you keep sitting by the lamp when the sun has come out? Why do you want milk when you are offered solids? The reason you were fed milk at first was so you wouldn't stay on milk; and the reason the lamp was shown you was so you might be led to the sun.

Then let's not run back to those old ways now that better things are at hand. Let's not observe days and seasons and anniversaries, but let us altogether keep in perfect step with the church, honoring love and peace above all things. For even if the church were in error, the honor of following a strict calendar would not equal the reproach of schism and separation.

I take no account of set times, because as I have demonstrated, God doesn't either. This is what I have spent so many words to prove to you. I have only one goal: that we do everything in peace and unity, and that, while I and all the people are fasting, and the priests are making common supplication for the whole world, you will not remain at home carousing.

Think how diabolical it is to do this, and how many sins it entails--not just one or two or three, but many more. It separates you from the flock and disposes you to despise so many Fathers. It throws you into contention, drives you to the Jews, and displays you publicly as a stumblingblock to our own people and to the outsiders alike; for how can we blame those who stay at home, if you run over to the Jews?[1]

---

[1] Greek, πρὸς ἐκείνους.

And these aren't the only sins involved, since great harm can result also from the fact that during the fast you don't enjoy the benefit of Scriptures, or meetings, or blessings, or public prayers. You spend the whole time with a guilty[1] conscience in fear and trembling, like some alien or foreigner, afraid you might get caught, when you ought to be sharing in all the church's celebrations happily, and freely, and with manly dignity.

The church knows nothing about precise dates. Long ago, however,[2] it seemed good to our distinguished Fathers to assemble together and ordain this particular day; and since the church prizes harmony everywhere and cherishes concord, she accepted what they decreed. That it is impossible for you, or me, or anyone else to celebrate the real date of Easter[3] anyway, has been proved sufficiently in what I have been saying.

Let us, then, stop fighting shadows. For the sake of little things, let's not hurt ourselves where it really matters.[4] It is no reproach to hold a fast on this or that date, but to divide the church, to get into an argumentative spirit, to produce divisions, and to deprive yourself continually of church meetings, this is unpardonable. It is truly reprehensible, and will be punished severely.

---

[1] Lit., "evil conscience." [2] Lit., "from the beginning."

[3] Lit., "to take hold of the Lord's day." Lampe cites this passage as referring to Easter. Article "Κυριακός."

[4] More lit., "Quarreling over anything that comes along, let us not harm ourselves in great matters."

Much more could be said, but I have said enough to convince those who are paying attention; and those who aren't, wouldn't be convinced even if I said more. So as we bring the sermon to a close, let us all pray together that our brothers will come back to us; that they will welcome peace and put away their unseemly quarreling, laugh this petty business to scorn, become big and generous, and be set free from the observance of dates; so that with one accord and with one voice we may all glorify God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom is glory and power, now, always, and for ever, Amen.

SERMON IV

BOTH PLACE AND TIME[1]

Another Jewish Fast Is Coming!

Once more those unhappy Jews, the most wretched of all men, are about to observe one of their fasts; and once more it is necessary to protect Christ's flock.

When no wild animals are about, shepherds settle down under an oak or pine[2] tree, playing on their flutes and leaving the sheep alone to graze at will; but the instant they sense wolves attacking, they drop their flutes and reach for their slings, they lay aside their pipes and arm themselves with clubs and stones, and rush out to make a stand, at the edge of the flock. But with a yell at the top of their voices they often drive the animals[3] away by sheer noise without needing to use their missiles.

We have been doing the same. Because no one was menacing us, we have for some days been "frolicking in the meadow" of the Bible story and avoiding controversial subjects. But now that the Jews, who are far more dangerous than any wolves, are about to surround our sheep, it is necessary to stand up today and fight, so that none of us will become a prey. Don't be surprised that we have taken up arms ten days or more before their fast is set to begin and are already building a stockade around your souls. Hard working farmers whose land is in danger of being eroded by winter floods don't wait for bad weather to set in, but reenforce the banks and build dikes and dig drainage ditches and get ready for winter in every way they can, before it comes. What is easy when a stream flows low and quiet is not so easy when its waters rise and rampage; and this, of course, is why they anticipate the emergency[1] so long in advance.

---

[1] The title in the Migne edition is, "His sermon against the Jews concerning their Passover Trumpets. Preached in Antioch in the Great Church." V560 omits, "in Antioch."

[2] V560 has λεύκη, "white poplar," instead of πεύκη, "pine."

[3] The Greek is singular.

Soldiers and sailors, farmers and reapers, all act the same way in this regard. Well before a battle, soldiers polish their breastplates, inspect their shields, prepare their bridles carefully, tend their horses with every concern, and arrange properly anything else that needs to be done. Before they launch a ship back into a harbor, sailors repair its keel, recondition its sides, polish the oars, sew up the sails, and do everything necessary to get it in condition. Reapers whet their scythes long days before the crop is ripe,[2] and get a threshing floor ready, and oxen and a wagon, and whatever else is needed for the harvest. In fact, one can only observe that everyone prepares for a thing ahead of time, so that when it comes he will be able to handle it more easily.

It is with this in mind then, that we are setting up a safeguard for your souls so many days ahead, and are urging you already to keep away from this cursed and sinful fast.

---

[1] Greek, ἐπιβολή, "attack." Seven MSS (incl. V560 and P804) have ἐπιβουλή, "plot/scheme/treachery."

[2] The words, "before the crop is ripe," have been added in translation.

God's Will Makes All the Difference

Don't tell me, "they are holding a fast!" Prove to me instead that they are doing it in harmony with God's will; for if they are not, their fasting is more wicked than if they were getting drunk.[1] It is not enough merely to ask what they are doing; one must also find out why they are doing it.

Whatever happens according to God's will, even if it seems to be wrong, is altogether right; and whatever happens against God's will, without His approval, is thoroughly evil and bad, even if it is thought to be good. Even murder, committed in obedience to the will of God, is better than any kindness done against His will, and an act of mercy or kindness done without His approval, is far worse[2] than murder. For it is not their intrinsic nature that makes identical things good or bad, but God's decision in respect to them.

Sec. 2 So you can see how true this is, listen! When Ahab captured a certain king of Syria[3] he saved his life, contrary to the will of God, and after showing him every courtesy, sent him away with great honor. Thereupon, a nearby prophet said to his neighbor, "'By the word of the Lord, hit me hard.' But the man would not hit him, and so the prophet said to him, 'Because you have not obeyed the voice of the Lord, behold, when you go away from me a lion[1] will strike you.' Accordingly, when he had gone away from him, the lion met him and killed him. Then he met another man and said, 'Hit me hard.' And the man hit him and wounded him; and he bandaged his face."[2]

---

[1] Lit., "than any drunkenness."

[2] Greek, ἀνοσιωτέρα. V560 has ἀνώτερα, "higher."

[3] Benhadad. The story is from I Kings 20:30-34.

What could be more paradoxical? The man who wounded the prophet was saved, and the one who spared him was punished! Why? To help you see that when God commands we must not question the nature of the act,[3] but only obey.

Notice that to keep the first man from sparing him out of respect, the prophet didn't say simply, "Hit me," but, "By the word of the Lord, hit me." That is, "God has commanded; ask no more. The one who issued the order is a King; respect His dignity and obey with alacrity." But the man refused and paid the supreme penalty. By his fate he warned those who lived after him to be submissive and obey whatever God commands.

After the second man had hit and wounded him, the prophet wrapped his head in a bandage, hiding his eyes and disguising himself. Why? Because he was about to expose the king and condemn him for saving the life of the king of Syria. And since the king was a godless man who always hated prophets and would doubtless drive this one off at sight and so fail to receive any correction, the prophet covered his face and camouflaged the story of what had happened in order to conquer the king with words and get him to concede all.

---

[1] Migne has, "the lion," but most MSS (incl. V560 and P804) omit the article.

[2] I Kings 20:35-38.

[3] Morel (with V560) has, "of what is spoken."

So when the king went past, the prophet called out and said, "Your servant went out to the battlefield and behold, a soldier brought a man to me and said, "Guard this man; if by any means he escapes, your life shall be for his life, or else you shall pay a talent of silver." And as your servant was busy here and there, he was gone.' The king of Israel said to him, 'In my estimation, you are your own judge. You have committed murder, . . .' Then the man quickly removed the bandage from his eyes, and the king of Israel recognized him as one of the sons of the prophets. And the prophet said to him, 'Thus says the Lord, because you let a destroyer[1] escape, your life shall be for his life, and your people for his people.'"[2]

Do you see that God is not alone in acting this way, but that people too evaluate a deed[3] not on the basis of the act itself but on the basis of its whys and wherefores? Notice what the king said to him, "In my estimation, you are your own judge. You have committed murder." Because you let the enemy soldier go, he said, you are a homicide.[4] The prophet, of course, had wrapped himself up in the bandage in order to elicit this very penalty as if it belonged to someone else, and so the king would pronounce his sentence with an unprejudiced mind; and things turned out as he had planned. Then after the king had condemned him, the prophet removed the bandage and said, "Because you let a destroyer escape, your life shall be for his life, and your people for his people."[1]

---

[1] The Greek, ἄνδρα ὀλέθριον, is translated as "a destructive man" by Thomson. The RSV renders, "a man I had devoted to destruction."

[2] I Kings 20:39-42 (III Reg. 21:39-42 LXX).

[3] Lit., "have this vote."

[4] Presumably, because the enemy soldier would kill Israelites.

Do you see the sort of punishment he suffered for being 30
kind, what sort of retribution he had to undergo for performing an act of mercy at the wrong time?[2] But though this man was punished for saving a life, another man was honored for committing a murder!

I mean Phineas. He committed two murders in a single critical moment, doing away with both a man and a woman together--and was honored with the priesthood! Far from staining his hands with the blood which he shed, he made them all the cleaner. So when you see the man who wounded the prophet going free, and the one who
didn't hit him being destroyed; when you see the man who showed 40
mercy being punished, and the one who showed none being highly honored, you must in every case pay careful attention to God's verdicts rather than to the acts themselves, and if you find that a given thing was done with God's approval, you must accept it without any question.[3]

Here is the rule, then, on the basis of which we must Sec. 3

---

[1] Ahab was killed in a battle against Benhadad three years later. II Kings 22.

[2] Both V560 and P804 omit, "at the wrong time."

[3] Or, "and nothing else." The Greek is μόνον.

examine the upcoming Jewish fast. If we don't do things this way but look into the bare facts alone, the result will only be utter confusion.[1] Thieves and grave-robbers and sorcerers are tortured until their sides are torn to ribbons. Martyrs undergo the same treatment; the very same thing happens to them both. But the intention and motive in each case is definitely not the same, and so there is a great difference after all. In such matters we don't stop short at the torture but look into the motives which occasioned it and the reasons why it was inflicted. This is why we love the martyrs, not because they were tortured, but because they were tortured for Christ's sake. And we loathe robbers, not because they are punished, but because they are punished for committing crimes.

And so this is the way in which you ought to evaluate what happens in the present case, and if you see a person fasting for God's sake, consider what he is doing as approved, but if you see him fasting against God's will, then despise and hate him more than if he were a drunken and carousing sot.[2]

But in respect to this fast, we must not only take motives into account; we must also investigate the matters of time and place. 1

Judaizing Christians Must Take a Stand

But before going on to attack the Jews I should like to talk to[1] our own members first, to those who are thought to be linked with us but who participate in Jewish worship[2] and are always taking up cudgels in the Jews' defense.

---

[1] Lit., "there will be much confusion and much uproar." V560 has, "will there not be much confusion, or rather, a great uproar?"

[2] Lit., "more than drunkards and those who behave in a drunken manner, and revellers."

In my estimation such people ought to be blamed more than the Jews themselves! And I know that not only the wise and intelligent, but everyone who has any powers of reasoning and understanding at all, will freely concede me this charge. There is no need for ingenious arguments or a fine style or long rhetorical periods to prove it. All that is necessary to convict them from their own words is to ask them a series of simple questions. I will ask each one who has this disease, "Well, are you a Christian? If you are, why are you so zealous for Judaism? Or are you a Jew? Then why do you annoy the Church?"

Don't Persians side with Persians? Aren't Barbarians pro-Barbarian? Don't men who live in the Roman Empire live according to our Roman way of life? Tell me, if a person living amongst us is caught siding with foreigners, isn't he punished summarily, without defense or trial, even though he can allege a thousand reasons for doing so? If someone living in a foreign country is detected of following Roman customs, does he not in turn suffer the very same fate? Then how can you expect to go free after you have changed over to an unlawful way of life?

Is the difference between us and Judaism just a little thing?

---

[1] Migne has διαλεξόμεθα, though some MSS (incl. V560 and P804) read διαλεξώμεθα.

[2] Lit., "who worship their things."

Is the controversy all about incidentals, leaving you free to think they are one and the same and to try to mix the unmixable?[1] The Jews crucified Christ, and you worship Him! That is how big the difference is. Do you see? How can you run over to those assassins, when you say you worship the Crucified?

Am I the first to use this formula of complaint, this type of accusation? Doesn't Scripture treat them this way too? Listen to what Jeremiah says to them: "Go to Kedar and see, or send to the coasts of Cyprus and make yourself aware, whether such things ever happened?"

What things?

"Whether Gentiles ever changed their gods, even though they really were not gods? But you have changed your glory for that which will not profit you."[2]

He doesn't say, "You changed your God," but, "You changed your glory."[3] Here is what he means: Those who worship idols and serve demons are so firm in their conviction of error that they will not choose to give it up and come over to the side of truth. But you who worship the true God have left the religion of your fathers and of your own accord turned to something else, and you have not shown so great a conviction for the truth as they have for error. This is why he asked, "Whether such things ever happened? Whether Gentiles ever changed their gods, even though they really were not gods? But you have changed your glory for that which will not profit you."

---

[1] With nine MSS (incl. V560 and P804), Migne has, ". . . to think that they are one and the same? Why do you try to mix the unmixable?"

[2] Jer. 2:10, 11, quoted freely. Lit., the last sentence is, "But you have changed your glory, from which you will not profit." Sermon i, p. 7, has a quotation from Jer. 2:20.

[3] This whole sentence is omitted from 9 MSS (incl. V560 and P804), and by Savile.

He does not say, "You have changed your God." God cannot be changed. But he says, "You have changed your glory." You haven't hurt Me, He says, for no harm can come to Me. You have dishonored yourselves. You have not diminished My glory, but your own.

Allow me now to say the same thing to our own people--if, indeed, it is proper to call them ours when their minds are filled with Judaism. Go into the synagogues and see if the Jews have changed their fast; whether, for example, they keep the paschal fast when we do or indulge in food on that day. Oh, theirs is no fast, but a crime and a sin and a fault! And yet, in spite of this, they haven't changed it. But "you have changed your glory for that which will not profit you"; you have gone over to their side. When have *they* kept the Easter fast? When have *they* shared our festival of the martyrs? When have *they* joined in celebrating Epiphany with us?

They don't come to the truth, but you run to lawlessness! (I say "lawlessness," because these things are practiced when they are no longer[1] appropriate. There was a time when it was necessary to observe them, but that time has now passed. Hence what was lawful once is unlawful now.)

Please let me tell them the story of Elijah. When Elijah Sec. 4
saw the Jews acting irreverently, now devoting themselves to God

---

[1] P804 has οὐκέτι for οὐκ ἔστι.

and now serving idols, he asked them, "How long will you go on limping with two different opinions? If the Lord our God is with you, come and follow Him; but if Baal, then follow him."[1] I ask the same question of these people now: "If you think Judaism is true, then why do you disturb the Church? But if Christianity is true, as it surely is, then stay here and follow it. Do you participate in the Mysteries? Tell me. Do you worship Christ as a Christian?[2] Do you demand His gifts--and then feast with His enemies? What do you have in mind when you come to church after doing that?

I have now completed all I need to say to those who claim to be Christians while they admire the Jewish rites.

God's Will Respecting Time and Place

I wish now to assail the Jews directly,[3] so let me give them a large lesson and show how the Jews, by continuing to fast at the present day, are dishonoring the law and trampling on God's ordinances, always doing everything opposite to what God approves. When He wanted them to fast, they anointed themselves and grew fat.[4] Now, when He wants[5] them not to fast, just to be different, they fast! When he wanted them to offer sacrifices, they ran off to idols; and now when He doesn't want them to celebrate festivals any more, they are eager to hold them.

---

[1] I Kings 18:21. Several MSS read, "If the Lord your God is with us," and V560 has simply, "If God is with you." Cf. III Reg. 18:21 LXX, which has, "If the Lord is God."

[2] Certain MSS (incl. V560 and P804) omit, "as a Christian."

[3] He announced that he would do this on p. 86, above.

[4] Cf. Deut. 32:15, cited also in Sermon i, p. 8, above.

[5] V560 and P804 have, "but when He wanted."

This is why Stephen told them, "You always resist the Holy Spirit."[1] For this one thing alone, said he, have you shown any enthusiasm--for doing the opposite of anything God requires--exactly as they are doing now.[2]

How can I demonstrate this? From the law itself. For the law not only specifies the time but also the place where the Jewish
festivals were to be observed. Talking to them about the Passover, 50
the law says, "You shall not be at liberty to keep the Passover in any ordinary city which the Lord your God gives you."[3] Just as He designated the fourteenth day of the first month as the date, so He also designated Jerusalem as the place for the celebration. He likewise stipulated both the time and the place for Pentecost when He commanded them to keep it seven weeks later, adding again, "in the place which the Lord your God shall appoint."[4] And He ordered the same for the Feast of Tabernacles.

But now let us see which is more crucial, the time or the place. When it is impossible to have both, is it better to keep the
time and disregard the place, or to keep the place and disregard the 1
time? I am referring to the fact that God commanded the Passover to

---

[1] Acts 7:51 RSV.

[2] Cf. Acts 7:51 RSV, "As your fathers did, so do you."

[3] Deut. 16:5-6.. This verse is quoted also in Sermon iii, p. 64, above.

[4] Cf. Deut. 16:6 and Deut. 12:11. There is no mention of Pentecost in or near either verse. Pentecost is mentioned in Lev. 23:16.

be kept both "in the first month" and "in Jerusalem," that is, at a prescribed time and in a designated place.

Let us suppose that two men are observing the Passover. The first is disregarding the place but keeping the time, and the second is disregarding the time but keeping the place. The one who is keeping the time is doing so in the first month, and is disregarding the place because he is at a long distance from Jerusalem; and the one who is keeping the place but disregarding the time is keeping the Passover in Jerusalem all right, but is doing so in the second month instead of the first.

Now, which one of these men is in the right and which one is in the wrong--the one who is disregarding the time but observing the place, or the one who is departing from the place but observing the correct time? For if the man who is disregarding the time in order to celebrate the Passover in Jerusalem, stands approved, while the one who is keeping the Passover on time but is doing so when he is away from the city, stands condemned, indicted as irreligious, it is clear that these Jews today who ignore the place, are sinners--even if they insist without ceasing that they are truly keeping the correct time.

Who can settle it for us? Moses himself! For, once, when a number of the people were keeping the Passover at some distance from the designated site, it is recorded that some men went to Moses and said, "'We are unclean through touching a dead man; must we fail to offer the Lord's gift at its appointed time among the people of Israel?' and Moses said to them, 'Wait, and I will hear what the

Lord will command concerning you.' And the Lord said to Moses, 'Say to the people of Israel, "If anyone of you or your descendants becomes unclean through touching a dead man, or is on a long journey, he shall keep the Passover in the second month."'"[1]

Here is what He means: Anyone who is[2] on a journey during the first month shall not celebrate the Passover where he happens to be, for he is away from Jerusalem; instead, he shall keep it in the second month after he has had time to reach the city. He shall disregard the set date so as not to fail to be in the prescribed city.

This proves that observing the set place is more important than holding to the set time.

Then what can they say who keep the Passover outside of Jerusalem? When they violate the more stringent requirement, their concern for the less important one cannot excuse them. Even if it appears in every way imaginable that they are keeping the correct date, they are still guilty of extreme wickedness.

That this is true is quite clear, not only from this passage, but from the prophets as well. And as it becomes apparent that the Jews of old, when in a foreign country, did not offer sacrifices, or sing songs of praise, or observe any of their fasts, we are led to ask, what kind of mercy will these modern Jews receive?

Although the Jews in exile hoped some day to return to their former customs, they obeyed the law and fulfilled the requirement which said that under such circumstances they should not observe these things. But the Jews today, who have no hope of ever recovering their former way of life (for where can they find any such hope in the prophets?[1]), refuse to desist! Yet, even if they had some reason to expect a restoration, they ought to imitate the holy men of old and neither fast nor do anything else of the kind.[2]

---

[1] Num. 9:7-11. Verses 7-10 are quoted also in Sermon iii, p. 72; but there it appears to be quoted by memory and here, from a written copy.

[2] V560 reads, "Anyone who wishes to be."

That they did not practice any of these things is shown by Sec. 5 the answer they gave some foreigners,[3] their tormentors, who urged them insistently to play their musical instruments and "sing us a song of the Lord."[4] Knowing well that the law forbade such activity away from home,[5] they replied, "How shall we sing the Lord's song in a foreign land?"[6]

Then, too, the three young men who lived in Babylon said, "At this time there is no prince or prophet, . . . no place to make an offering before Thee or to find mercy."[7] There was, of course, a large "place" there, but because the temple was not in existence at the time,[8] they carried on without offering sacrifices.

---

[1] Some MSS (incl. V560 and P804) have, "they cannot . . . ."

[2] Following Savile, Migne has, "and fast, indeed, but do nothing else of the kind." V560 has, "and neither fast nor say anything else of the kind."

[3] Lit., "barbarians."

[4] Ps. 137:3. The Greek is loosely quoted from Ps. 136:3 LXX, and has, "Lord," where the LXX has, "Sion."

[5] Greek, ἔξω.

[6] Ps. 137:4 (Ps. 136:4 LXX).

[7] The Prayer of Azariah 15 RSV.

[8] Or, "because the temple was not there."

Later on, in reference to the period of the captivity, God asked other Jews through Zechariah,[1] "For these seventy years, have you observed any fast for me?"[2]

How can you observe fasts nowadays, O Jew, when your fathers neither offered sacrifices, nor observed fasts, nor celebrated festivals?

And that they did not celebrate the Passover during the Captivity is unquestionably clear from this, that where there were no sacrifices, neither were there any feasts, for all the festivals required the offering of sacrifices.

But to furnish additional, specific proof that the Passover was not observed, hear what Daniel says: "In those days I, Daniel, was mourning. For three weeks I ate no delicacies; no wine or meat entered my mouth, neither did I anoint myself during those weeks. And on the twenty-fourth day of the first month . . . I saw the vision."[3]

Pay very close attention to me now, for it can be proved from this passage that the Jews did not celebrate the Passover during the Captivity.

Why do I say this?

In the days of Unleavened Bread, the Jews were not permitted to observe a fast--yet Daniel ate absolutely nothing for twenty-one days!

"And how do you know," someone asks, "that these twenty-one days included the Feast of Unleavened Bread?"

---

[1] Lit., "Zacharias." [2] Zech. 7:5 RSV. [3] Dan. 2:2-4, 7.

From Daniel's own words when he said, "On the twenty-fourth day of the first month."

The Passover ends on the twenty-first. Beginning on the fourteenth day of the first month, the Jews feast for seven days and thus arrive at the twenty-first day.[1] In spite of this, Daniel continued fasting even after the Passover was over. For beginning on the third day of the first month he spent twenty-one days fasting, going right on past the fourteenth day for an additional[2] week and three days beyond it.

Then if none of their own holy men preserved any of these customs when living on foreign soil, how cursed and polluted are these Jews today, who, out of cantankerous obstinacy, do the very opposite! If they had been irresponsible and irreverent men who spoke and acted this way, it would be fair to consider their non-observance as arising from their indifference. But they were pious, religious men, men who gave their lives for the cause of God,[3] and so it is quite clear that their failure to observe the law was not a frivolous thing but proceeded from their obedience to the law itself, which decreed that all these customs[1] must not be observed outside of Jerusalem.

---

[1] Cf. Lev. 23:5-6 RSV, "In the first month, on the fourteenth day of the month in the evening, is the Lord's passover. And on the fifteenth day of the same month is the feast of unleavened bread to the Lord; seven days you shall eat unleavened bread."

[2] Four MSS (incl. P804) have ἔπειτα instead of ἑπτά, and read simply, "past the fourteenth day for a further three days beyond it." V560 has εἶτα, and approximately the same meaning as these four MSS.

[3] Lit., "for the things God approved."

And from this evidence something else of great importance can be gathered, namely, that their former way of life required the observance of sacrifices, sabbaths, new moons, and similar things in utter profusion,[1] but that neither was their faithful observance able to contribute anything significant to moral excellence, nor their 1
neglect, to make a good man bad or diminish in any degree the love for wisdom in his soul. These men who demonstrated by their wisdom a way of life on earth rivalling that of the angels, did not observe any of these customs; they offered no sacrifices, celebrated no festivals, and observed no set fasts. Yet through their behaviour they pleased God so far as to prevail over nature itself, and through what happened to them, to attract the whole world to the knowledge of God.[2]

With what shall we compare Daniel or the three young men, who, 10
as their actions reveal, anticipated the highest precept in the Gospels, the sum and substance of everything that is good? For the Gospel says, "Greater love has no man than this, than a man lay down his life for his friends,"[3] but they laid down their lives for God. More

---

[1] Or, "over and above the basic requirements." The Greek is ἐκ περιουσίας.

[2] When Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego were thrown into the burning fiery furnace, they were not burned, and thus they "prevailed over nature." A "fourth . . . like a son of the gods" (or "an angel of the Lord," The Prayer of Azariah 26 RSV), stood with them in the fire, showing their constancy to be worthy of the angels. After they came out of the fire, Nebuchadnezzar issued a decree that "Any people, nation, or language that speaks anything against the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego shall be torn limb from limb," showing how they had attracted the world to themselves and to God. Dan. 2:21-29 RSV.

[3] John 15:13 RSV.

than this, they are to be admired because they did it without expecting a reward. "God in heaven," they said, ". . . is able to deliver us . . . ; but if not, be it known to you, O king, that we will not serve your gods."[1] In other words, to die for God is reward enough for us.

And they behaved like this, mind you, and showed themselves to be men of this stripe, at a time when they were not observing any of the customs stipulated in the law.

Sec. 6 "But why did God command these things," someone asks, "if He didn't want them to be done?" And if He did want them to be done, O Jew, why did He destroy your city?

Obviously, if God had wanted these customs to be perpetuated, He would have had to do one of two things. Either, since He was going to scatter you all over the world, He should not have commanded you to sacrifice in only one place; or, if He had really wanted you to sacrifice only in Jerusalem, He should not have scattered you all over the world and made that one city inaccessible in which alone He required[2] the sacrifices to be offered.

"So what shall we conclude?" someone asks. "Is God inconsistent with Himself, commanding sacrifices to be offered in only one place and then sealing off that very location?"

Not by any means! On the contrary, He is very much in agreement with Himself. God didn't want to assign you sacrifices in the first place; and to prove it, I shall call in a prophet as witness. "Hear the word of the Lord, you rulers of Sodom!" he says; "pay attention to the law of your God, you people of Gomorrah!"[1] He is not addressing the Sodomites, of course, or the people who actually lived in Gomorrah, but the Jews. He addresses them in this way because they incurred a kinship with the people of Sodom and Gomorrah by imitating their sins. (In a similar way he calls them dogs[2] and stallions mad for mares,[3] not because they had turned into these kinds of animals but because they emulated their lust.)

---

[1] Dan. 3:17-18.

[2] Both V560 and P804 add here a form of κελεύω.

"'What to me is the multitude of your sacrifices?' says the Lord," he goes on. The people of Sodom were never conspicuous for offering sacrifices. The argument is really directed to the Jews, under the name of Sodomites, for the reason which I have just stated.

"'What to me is the multitude of your sacrifices?' says the Lord. 'I have had enough of burnt offerings of rams. I have no pleasure in the fat of lambs or the blood of bulls and goats, or in your coming to appear before Me, for who has required all these things of you?"[4]

Did you hear His voice with utmost clarity declaring that at first He wanted none of these things of you? Why, if He really desired such things, He would have led all the famous men of old, the men who were illustrious in earliest times,[5] into this way of life.

---

[1] Isa. 1:10. [2] Isa. 56:10. [3] Jer. 5:8.

[4] Isa. 1:11, 12. This passage is quoted again in Sermon vii, p. 210, below.

[5] Lit., "before them." Five MSS (incl. V560 and P804) have, "among them."

"How can you explain, then," someone asks, "that God did later permit the sacrifices to be offered?"

By His condescension to your weakness. Like a doctor. Sometimes a doctor examines a patient who has a high fever and who is weak and peevish, desperate for a drink of cold water, and threatening to hang himself if he doesn't get it, or to throw himself over a cliff. In his desire to forestall the greater evil, the doctor allows the lesser, hoping to save the man from a violent death.[1]

And this is what God did. He saw the Jews raving mad, choking themselves in their lust for sacrifices, and ready if they didn't get them, to desert to idolatry--or rather, not ready to do so, but already doing so. Then it was that He permitted the sacrifices. The very occasion makes it plain that this was the reason, for He allowed the sacrifices immediately after that feast which they held for the evil demons.[2] It was as if He said, "You are mad and want to offer sacrifices; very well then, offer sacrifices to Me."

But even though He went this far and permitted the sacrifices, He did not allow them unreservedly. Instead, by a highly skillful device, He led them away from the sacrifices once more. Just like the doctor I mentioned, who complies with his patient's burning desire for water--for there is nothing to keep me from using the same illustration again: First, he gets a cup out of his supplies and makes an order that the patient is to drink water[1] out of it and none other. Then, after gaining the patient's consent to this procedure, he gives a secret order to those who administer the cup to break it. In this way he weans the patient from his craving without being suspected or noticed.

---

[1] Some MSS (incl. V560 and P804) have, "hoping to save the man's life from coming to an end."

[2] Presumably this refers to the worship of the golden calf, when "they rose up early on the morrow, and offered burnt offerings and brought peace offerings; and the people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play" (Ex. 32:6 RSV). The institution of the Levitical ceremonial system immediately follows this event in the book of Exodus.

God did the same. After permitting them to offer sacrifices He allowed them to do so nowhere in the world except in Jerusalem. Then after they had offered sacrifices for a short time[2] He destroyed the city. Like the doctor who broke the dish, God intended by demolishing the city to lead the Jews away from the practice in spite of themselves. For if He had said plainly, "Keep off!", they wouldn't have consented willingly to giving up their mania for sacrifices; but as it is, by imposing the requirement of a set place, God has delivered them from it unawares.

So let the doctor be God, the cup the city, the irritable patient the Jewish people, and the drink of cold water the permission and liberty to offer sacrifices. Then just as the doctor checked the sick man's inadvisable demand by doing away with the cup, so God diverted the Jews from offering sacrifices by destroying the city and by making it inaccessible. For if this is not what He wished to accomplish, then why did He who is present everywhere and who fills all things confine a ritual of this sort to one place? And after limiting the cultus to sacrifices, the sacrifices to a set place, the set place to a particular time, and the particular time to a single city, why did He afterwards raze that very city to the ground?

---

[1] Lit., "cold water."

[2] Chrysostom's foreshortened conception of time manifested here may help to explain his application of OT statements to the Jews of his own day, apparently unaware of any change in time or place. See especially Sermon i, above.

Indeed, the amazing and paradoxical thing is that while the whole world, in which it is unlawful to offer sacrifices, has been opened up to the Jews, yet Jerusalem, where it is lawful to do so, has alone become inaccessible to them.[1] I ask you, isn't the reason for this destruction plain and obvious even to unthinking people? If, after a builder has laid a foundation, raised walls, vaulted a roof, and united the vault to one central keystone, he later removes the keystone, he destroys the entire building at one stroke. In the same way, after God had made the city a sort of keystone holding the whole Jewish worship together, when He overthrew the city, He destroyed the entire structure of their way of life.

All Christians Must Save the Lost at Any Cost

So much for the battle with the Jews for the time being. Sec. 7
Today we have merely skirmished with them and said only what was needed to protect our own people,[2] or rather, considerably more than that. From now on it is necessary to urge you who are present to manifest a deep concern for our members,[3] and not to say,

---

[1] Cf. Eusebius EH iv. 6.

[2] Lit., "our brothers."

[3] Or, "to show great care for our affairs/our brothers." This is the reading in Savile. Morello and certain MSS (incl. V560) read, "to make much of the passing days," and four MSS (incl. P804) read, "to make much of the available days."

"Why should I care?"

Why am I working so hard and going to such trouble?[1] Our Master died for us, and will none of you utter a word? What kind of mercy will you deserve? What kind of defense will you find? How can you hope to stand confidently at Christ's tribunal[2] if you disregard the loss of so many souls?

If it had been possible for me to know personally those who are going over there, I would not have needed your help. I would have set things right in a hurry.

When you ought to correct a brother, even if you need to give your life for him, don't refuse to imitate your Master. And if you have a servant, or a wife, keep them strictly at home. If you don't let them attend the theater, how much more important it is to keep them away from the synagogue, a far more wicked place. There is sin, indeed, in the theater, but sheer blasphemy[3] in the synagogue. I don't mean to say that you should feel free to let them attend the theater, for that is bad enough, but that you should keep them away from the synagogue[4] all the more.

What do you go to see in the synagogue of those God-fighting

---

[1] Or, "Why do I go out of my way and meddle?" Instead of assigning this question to the speaker, it could be joined with the previous question as coming from the people.

[2] Cf. II Cor. 5:10 RSV, "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ," and I John 4:17 RSV, "that we may have confidence for the day of judgment."

[3] With the phrase, "sheer blasphemy," I have heightened the ordinary translations of ἀσέβεια, because "impiety" and "godlessness" do not seem to convey the impact demanded by the context.

[4] Savile reads, "from both places all the more."

Jews anyway, tell me? Men blowing trumpets![1] What you ought to do is to stay home and weep and sigh for them, because they are fighting against the commands of God and dancing with the devil. For just as I said before, whatever is done contrary to God's will becomes a basis for incalculable punishments, even if at some time in the past God has permitted it.

The Jews regularly blew the trumpets during the time when they were still offering sacrifices, but they have no right to do so anymore. Listen to the reason why they got the trumpets in the first place. The Bible says, "Make for yourself silver trumpets of hammered work;" then it states their purposes: "And you shall blow them over your burnt offerings and over the sacrifices of your peace offerings."[2] But where is the altar now? Where is the ark? Where are the tabernacle and the holy of holies? Where is the priest? Where are the cherubim of glory? Where is the golden altar of incense? Where is the mercy seat? Where is the basin?[3] Where are the libation cups?[4] Where is the fire[5] that came down from heaven?[6] Everything else has been taken away, and will you still hold on to the trumpets? Don't you see that today, instead of serving the purposes of worship, the trumpets merely provide music?

---

[1] Certain MSS (incl. V560 and P804) read, "Why do you go to see men blowing trumpets?"

[2] Num. 10:2-5, 10, quoted freely.

[3] V560 and P804 read, "Where are the basins?"

[4] The tabernacle and its furnishings and utensils are described in Ex. 25-30. Cf. also Heb. 9:1-5.

[5] Fire, or glory, is reported to have descended in the time of Moses, Ex. 40:34-38; of Solomon, II Chron. 7:1-2; and of Elijah, I Kings 18:38. Chrysostom seems to have believed that it fell regularly on the sacrifices. See Sermon v, p. 159, Sermon vi, p. 181, below.

[6] Lit., "from above."

But just as we accuse the Jews of sinning, so also and much more so do we accuse you, because you join in with sinners; and we accuse not only those of you who concur with them but also those who have the power to prevent others from doing so but who wish to do nothing about it.

Don't say to me, "What do I have in common with them? They are perfect strangers to me."

As long as a man is a believer, one who attends the same church and shares in the same Mysteries, he is closer to you than your brothers are, or your relatives, or your close friends.

Not only thieves but those too who have power to stop them but do not use it, suffer the same punishment. Just so, not only irreligious people but those also who have the power to lead them away from their sacrilege but--whether through cowardice or laziness--do not wish to do so, receive the same punishment.

The man who buried his talent, returned it in full to his master; but because he had not made it grow, he was punished just the same. In the same way, if you keep yourself pure and innocent but do not make your talent grow by restoring a perishing brother to safety, you will suffer the same as he.

What is the great request that I wish to make of you, my dear friends?[1] That each of you restore to me one of our brothers; that you work hard and become actively involved,[1] so that we may enter the approaching meeting[2] with every confidence, bringing gifts to God; gifts more precious than anything, the souls of those who were led astray, but whom we have brought back.

---

[1] Lit., "beloved."

Even if we have to be insulted or beaten, or have to endure anything else whatever, let us do everything in our power to win them back. We don't mind the kicks and insults and hard words of sick people; we are not stung by their abuse. All we want is to see these people who act so disgracefully restored to health again. Many a time a patient has torn his doctor's clothes, but this hasn't kept the physician from applying his treatment. If a man who looks after the body provides such care, how unreasonable it is to stand idle when souls in such numbers are being lost! To think that we are in no danger, when our very limbs--our fellow church-members--are rotting away!

Paul wasn't like this. What did he do? "Who is weak," said he, "and I am not weak? Who is made to fall, and I am not indignant?"[3]

Adopt his indignation! If you see a brother being lost, even if he reviles you, and insults you, and hits you, and threatens to be your enemy, even if he menaces you in any way imaginable, take it all manfully and thereby win his salvation. And if he should become your enemy, God will be your friend, and will reward you greatly with good things on that Day.

---

[1] Or, "interfere and meddle."

[2] Greek, σύναξις.

[3] II Cor. 11:29 RSV.

Through the prayers of the saints may those who have been led astray be recovered, and all of you bag your game. May the very blasphemers, delivered from their godlessness, acknowledge the Christ who for them was crucified; and may we all with one voice and with one accord glorify the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom is glory and power, with the Holy Spirit, for ever and ever, Amen.[1]

---

[1] V560 and P804 omit, "and power, with the Holy Spirit."

SERMON V

PROPHECY FULFILLED[1]

The Previous Sermon Reviewed

Why has our congregation grown larger today? No doubt 1
because you have come to make me keep my promise. You are here to collect the "refined silver" I agreed to hand out. For "the words of the Lord," says Scripture, "are words of pure silver refined in an earthen furnace."[2]

God be blessed, who has inspired you with such longing for
spiritual instruction. For just as tipplers and winebibbers go to
great lengths every day to discover where there are drinking bouts, 10
banquets, dinners, carousals, and mixing bowls, drinking bowls, wine cups, and drunkenness, so you are bestirring yourselves every day to find out where there is counsel, advice, encouragement, and instruction, and where preaching aims at the glory of Christ.[3]

As a result, I take up my topic the more eagerly, and cheerfully deliver what I promised you.

The struggle with the Jews has found a fitting close. The trophy has been erected; the wreath has been perfected for us. I seized the prize of victory with my previous address,[1] for the very thing I was eager to prove to you,[2] that what the Jews are doing today is an unlawful thing, a transgression, a battle and a war of men against God, has been demonstrated--with God's help--unerringly.

---

[1] The title in Migne is simply, "The Fifth Sermon Against the Jews."

[2] Lit., "in a furnace on the ground." Ps. 12:6 (Ps. 11:7 LXX).

[3] V560 reads, "and where preaching contributes to the message of Christ."

For even if the Jews were going to regain Jerusalem, and reestablish their former way of life, and see the temple rebuilt (which they certainly are not!), they would still have no excuse for what they are now doing. The three young men, and Daniel, and all the others who lived during the Captivity, expected to recover their city, and after seventy years to see the soil of their fatherland and live once more under their former customs. But in spite of having a public and undeniable pledge to this effect, they never presumed, before the promise was fulfilled and they had actually returned to Jerusalem, to perform any of the acts of the law such as the Jews are observing today.[3]

Here is how you too can silence the Jew. Ask him, "Why do you still fast, now that you no longer possess the city?" And if he replies, "I expect to recover the city," say to him, "You should desist until you do recover it. Even those holy men who lived during the Captivity[4] never ventured to do what you are doing before their return to their own country, and this makes it clear that you are wrong, even if you are going to get the city back as you assert. You are violating the articles of your compact with God, and outraging your way of life itself."

---

[1] Usener believes the sermon referred to here has been lost. See the Introduction, above; and compare, also, n. 3, below.

[2] Lit., "to us."

[3] Cf. Sermon iv, pp. 93-98, above.

[4] The words, "who lived during the Captivity," have been added in translation.

What has been said in my former sermon is enough to curb the
brash behavior of the Jews and prove them to be transgressors, and
also to satisfy your love. But because all along I have been eager
not only to silence the Jews but also to educate the church better 1
in her own doctrines, let me prove all over again, profusely, that
the temple will never be rebuilt and that the Jews will never return
to their former way of life. By my doing this, you will advance into
a more precise understanding of apostolic doctrine, and the Jews will
be convicted more damningly of godlessness.

Christ's Prophecy about Jerusalem and the Temple

As my witness to these matters, I shall provide not an angel,
or even an archangel, but the Master of the whole world Himself, our
Lord Jesus Christ. For as Christ entered Jerusalem on one occasion
He caught sight of the temple and said, "Jerusalem will be trodden
down by many Gentiles until the times of the many Gentiles are ful- 10
filled";[1] that is, until the end of time. And again, when He was
talking to the disciples about the temple, He made this threat,
"There will not be left in this place one stone upon another that

---

[1] Luke 21:24, quoted freely. Some MSS (incl. P804) have, "until many times of the Gentiles are fulfilled." The RSV gives, "Jerusalem will be trodden down by the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled."

has not been thrown down,"[1] foretelling its complete desolation and utter obliteration.

But the Jew positively rejects this testimony and accepts nothing that has been said. "The person who made those statements is an enemy of mine," he retorts. "I crucified him. How can I possibly accept his testimony?" But the amazing thing, O Jew, is this, that after His crucifixion, the One whom you crucified destroyed your city, and scattered your people, and spread your race everywhere, showing that He has risen from the dead, and is alive, and is now in heaven. Because you did not wish to understand His power by means of His kindness, He taught you His irresistible and invincible strength through punishment and the rod.

But even so you do not believe. You do not consider Him to be God and the Master of the whole world, but take Him to be just an ordinary man.[2] Very well, then, let us examine the matter as if He were just an ordinary man. But what procedure do we adopt when testing men? When we see a man who consistently tells the truth and never lies, if we are rational beings, don't we accept what he says as true, even if he happens to be an enemy of ours? On the other hand, when we see a liar, we don't accept easily what he says, even when he tells the truth about some one thing in particular.

Christ's Integrity as a Prophet.--So let us see what kind Sec. 2
of character Christ had, and what His manner of life was. For

---

[1] Lit., "until [ἕως ἂν] it is thrown down." Cf. Matt. 24:2 and Mark 13:2.

[2] Lit., "a man, one of the many."

this prophecy[1] isn't the only one He ever made. He predicted many other things as well, that were to be fulfilled after a long period of time. Let us turn our attention, then, to these other prophecies, and if you see Him lying in any one of them, don't accept that prediction or consider it[2] trustworthy. But if you see Him always telling the truth, and that the prophecy has been fulfilled, and if you see an immense amount of time endorsing the truth, don't keep on being brazen; don't resist facts that are clearer than the sun. 50

Let us then look at these other things which He foretold.

The Woman with the Alabaster Flask.--A woman came up to Him carrying a very expensive alabaster flask of perfumed ointment and poured out the contents. The disciples criticized what she had done
and asked, "Why wasn't this sold for three hundred denarii and given 1
to the poor?" But Jesus reprimanded them and said, "Why do you trouble this woman? She has done a beautiful thing. And I say to you, wherever this gospel is preached in all the earth, what she has done will be told in memory of her."[3]

Did He tell a lie or did He tell the truth? Was the prophecy fulfilled or did it fail? Ask a Jew, and no matter how hardened he may be,[4] he won't be able to look this prophecy in the face! For in every church we hear the woman spoken of. There they stand listening, consuls and generals, men and women, the famous, the notable, the illustrious in every city. Wherever you are in all the world, everyone is listening[1] in hushed silence to this woman's good deed. There is no part of the world where her act is unknown.

---

[1] That is, about the temple.

[2] The sense seems to require "Him," but the Greek is αὐτῆν, referring to the prediction.

[3] Matt. 26:9-10, 13.

[4] Lit., "even if he be ten thousand times shameless."

How many kings have brought great blessings to their dominions, and waged successful wars, and erected many trophies, and rescued nations, and founded cities, and gathered in great riches, and then, in spite of all, have gone down into silence with all their achievements! How many queens and noble women have brought countless blessings to their subjects, yet are unknown today even by name! But this common woman, after merely pouring out some ointment, is celebrated throughout the world. Vast periods of time have not quenched her memory, nor ever will.

Yet what she did was not conspicuous. What does it amount to, to pour some oil? Nor was her person remarkable, for she was an outcast. Nor were those who saw her do it numerous, for she did it in the company of the disciples. And neither was the place well known, for she did it not in a theater but in a house while only ten men were present.[2] Nevertheless, neither the inconsequence of her person, nor the fewness of those who saw her, nor the insignificance of the place, nor any other consideration, has succeeded in erasing her memory. This woman is more famous today than any queen or king, and no length of time has consigned her deed to oblivion.

---

[1] Montfaucon has, "you will hear."

[2] If all the disciples were present, and Christ, and the host for the occasion, Simon the leper, there were more men there than ten.

How can you explain it? Tell me. Who is the cause of it? Isn't the Cause of it the God who was served there,[1] who spread the story everywhere?

Tell me, is it within human ability to make a prediction like this? Who is there with any sense who will say so? To predict successfully a thing done by oneself is marvelous and challenges belief; but to predict the actions of others and cause the prediction to be acceptable and evident to all, is much greater and more marvelous.

The Church Founded on the Rock.--But let me take another example. To Peter Christ made the prophecy, "On this rock I will build My church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it."[2]

Well, Jew, what can you attack in this prophecy so as to prove it false? But whatever you say, the facts are against you, even if you insist a thousand times. How many wars have been fanned against the church, how many camps pitched, how many implements of war[3] set in motion,[4] or kinds of punishment and persecution contrived--frying pans and catapults, cauldrons and furnaces, cisterns, precipices, the teeth of wild animals, the open seas, confiscation of goods, and other modes of torture without number, indescribable in word and unbearable in fact![1] And not only by those outside the church but also by those within; for a certain civil war gripped everything at that time, or rather, something far worse than a civil war. Not only did one citizen clash against another, but relatives, too, fought with relatives, and members of a household against other members of the same household, and friends with friends.[2] Yet in spite of all, none of these things destroyed the church or made it any weaker.

---

[1] V560 reads, "the Person who was crucified." [2] Matt. 16:18.

[3] Or, "men-at-arms." The Greek is ὅπλα.

[4] Greek, ἐκινήθη. Montfaucon has ἠκονήθησαν, "sharpened."

The amazing paradox is, indeed, that all of this was stirred up at the beginning of things. For if these terrors had been brought to bear when the Gospel had been planted all around the world and had taken root, it would not have been so surprising that the church was not led astray by the persecution. But that such wars broke out at the beginning of the teaching, when the faith had just been sown and the resolution of our hearers was still weak, the fact that our cause did not diminish but, on the contrary, grew greater, is the wonder which surpasses all others.

---

[1] In his account of the Diocletian persecution, Eusebius (*EH* viii) makes frequent references to martyrdom by wild beasts. In 6. 6 he tells of large numbers of martyrs being burned on pyres and of multitudes being cast into the sea. Catapults were used as instruments of torture (Liddell and Scott), and Eusebius tells of many persons who were tortured on racks. Chrysostom's reference to frying pans and cauldrons (τήγανα and λέβητες) may go back to the Maccabean martyrs, who were popular heroes among the Christians of Antioch in his day. II Macc. 7 says that in persecuting a mother and her seven sons Antiochus called for pans and cauldrons (τήγανα and λέβητας).

[2] Eusebius (*EH* viii. 1. 7) says that as the period of peace came to an end prior to the Diocletian persecution, "a change to vanity and laziness came over our affairs and we envied and reviled one another, warring (προσπολεμούντων) with ourselves, . . . rulers attacking rulers, and people forming parties against people." In The *Martyrs of Palestine* xii he says that it is his "intention to

Indeed, it was to prevent your saying that the established position of the Church today is a result of the peace which the emperors have vouchsafed, that God permitted it to be bitterly opposed when it was smaller and seemingly weaker. It was to help you see that its present security is not derived from the peace of kings but from the power of God.

Christ Contrasted with Pagan and Jewish Leaders.--To see how true this is, think how many men, such as Zeno, Plato, Socrates, Diagoras, Pythagoras,[1] and the host of others, have attempted to introduce new theories and set up novel constitutions among the Greeks. So far from succeeding in their efforts, their very names are unfamiliar to the masses today. But Christ not only wrote a constitution, He also established it in all the world. How many wonders Apollonius of Tyana is said to have performed; but to show that the story about him is nothing but a lying fiction, it is unheard today. Sec. 3 30

---

omit" reporting how divine Justice condemned to the oversight of camels and horses those pastors who had "not presided in harmony with the law," or about "the passion for power which possessed many, and the hasty and unlawful ordinations, the divisions which developed among the confessors themselves, and what the youthful agitators zealously devised against what was left of the Church, adding innovations to novelties, . . . and building evil upon evil."

[1] Migne states merely that one codex has, "Anaxagoras," instead of, "Pythagoras." In the ten MSS which I have examined, however, there is considerably more variety than this. All ten contain the

Let no one consider it an insult to Christ that in talking about Him I have mentioned Pythagoras, Plato, Zeno, and the Tyanan.[1] I have not done it of my own will, but out of condescension to the weakness of the Jews, who think that He was only a mere man. Paul did the same when he went to Athens. He did not address the Athenians from either the prophets or the gospels but based his exhortation on an altar--not because he thought the altar was more trustworthy than the gospels, or that its inscription was more honorable than the prophets, but because he was talking to Greeks, men who held to none of our truths. In this way he conquered them, by starting from their own beliefs. He says, "To the Jews I became as a Jew; . . . to those outside the law I became as one outside the law--not being without law toward God but under the law to Christ."[2]

The Old Testament uses the same method when talking to the Jews about God. It asks, "Who is like Thee, O Lord, among the gods?"[3]

What, Moses? Is there really any comparison?

---

names of Zeno, Plato, and Socrates, and all save one (Vatican Gr. 575) also contain Diagoras. On the other hand, only two MSS (Oxford: Auct. E. 1. 13 and Vat. Gr. 575) agree with Migne in naming Pythagoras. All save one of the others give Anaxagoras (misspelled "Anagoras" in V560 and Mt. Sinai: Mon. Lib., Gr. 375). The one exception (Jerusalem: Pat. Lib., S. Sabas 36), gives neither Pythagoras nor Anaxagoras. Zeno and Plato wrote πολιτεῖαι, and Socrates is the speaker who propounds Plato's Republic. Diagoras of Melos was a celebrated atheist, and Anaxagoras was exiled from Athens on the charge of impiety. Pythagoras was banished from Crotona for trying to impose his philosophical way of life on the entire city.

[1] That is, Apollonius. P804 omits, "Zeno"; and V560 omits, "and the Tyanan."

[2] I Cor. 9:20-21.

[3] Ex. 15:11 RSV.

"I am not saying this to make a comparison!" he replies. "I use this technique because I am talking to the Jews, a people who hold demons in very high regard. I am condescending to their weakness."

2 It is because my sermon today is directed to the Jews, who consider Christ to be an ordinary sinful man[1] just as pagans do, that I have examined men who are admired by the pagans. But, if you wish, I shall also attempt to prove the same thing by examples taken from Jews who tried to do what these famous Greeks did--who gathered disciples and were proclaimed as leaders and rulers, and who were then suddenly snuffed out. Gamaliel silenced them this way once. Seeing the Jews raving with a desire to shed the disciples' blood and wishing to restrain their uncontrolled frenzy, he commanded the disciples to be put outside for a moment and then said to the Jews, "Take care what you do with these men. For before these days Theudas arose, giving himself out to be somebody, and four hundred men joined him; but he himself perished, and all who followed him were scattered. After him Judas the Galilean arose, who drew away a considerable crowd; but he too was slain and his disciples perished. So in the present case I tell you, take care with these men, for if this undertaking is of men, it will fail; but if it is of God, you will not be able to overthrow it. You might even be found opposing God!"[2]

---

[1] Lit., "to be a mere man and a transgresser."

[2] Acts 5:35-39, quoted freely.

What was Gamaliel's proof that merely human enterprises of this sort always fail? The examples of Judas and Theudas. If this person, he said, who is being proclaimed by the disciples, is the same kind of man as they are, if He does not do everything with divine power, wait a little while, and the very outcome of affairs will verify what you are saying. By[1] the way things turn out you will know definitely whether this man is a sinful imposter, as you say, or whether he is God, the One who sustains all things and manages our affairs with ineffable power. And this, of course, is how it happened. For as the Jews waited, divine and invincible power was manifested through the events themselves, and the clever device which was intended to deceive the people boomeranged on the devil.

For when the devil saw that Christ had come, he set up the various impostors we have mentioned for the purpose of obscuring His Advent and the truth about His incarnation,[2] and of getting Christ to be considered as merely one of them. And what he did in connection with His Coming, the devil did also at the Cross, when he saw to it that two thieves were crucified with Him, eagerly hoping to becloud the truth by placing it in proximity to error; but he accomplished no more in this attempt than in the other. In fact, the presence of the thieves demonstrated Christ's power all the more. Tell me; if three were crucified in the same place, at the same time, and by the same judges, why is it that two of them have sunk into oblivion, and One of them, alone, is worshipped?

---

[1] Some MSS (incl. V560 and P804) read, "Before."

[2] Greek, οἰκονομία. Lampe: "virtually synonymous with ἐπανθρώπησις."

Again, if many men introduced new constitutions and enjoyed a following but today are unknown even by their names, why is it exactly, that One alone is worshipped all around the world? Comparison makes facts stand out most plainly; so make the comparison, O Jew, and learn the superiority of truth. What imposter acquired so many churches everywhere in the world? And extended His worship from one end of the world to the other? And had everyone bowing to Him, in spite of uncounted obstacles?

None at all!

Then there can be no doubt about it. Christ was not an imposter, but a Saviour, and a Benefactor, and the Guardian and Protector of our lives.

Not Peace but a Sword.--Now I shall add one more prophecy, and then proceed to my theme. "I have not come to bring peace on earth, . . . but a sword," He said, expressing not His own opinion but what was actually going to happen. "For I have come to set a man against his father, and a bride against her mother-in-law, and a daughter against her mother."[1] How could He have predicted this, tell me, if He had been just an ordinary man?[2] What He is saying is that when a home is divided between believers and unbelievers,--

---

[1] Matt. 10:34-35.

[2] Lit., "a mere man, and one of the many."

such as when a pagan father wishes to lead a Christian son into his own life of godlessness,--the power of the message will so triumph that the son will disregard his father, and the daughter her mother, and the parents their children. And they will prefer not only to disregard the members of their own families, but even to give up their lives and endure and suffer anything rather than deny their religion.

How was Christ able to know all this and then bring it about, if He was just an ordinary man? How did it occur to Him to suppose that to children He would appear more deserving of respect than fathers? And to fathers, be dearer than children? And to wives, more beloved than husbands? And this, not only in one home, or in two or three, or in ten or twenty or a hundred, but in homes all over the world, in every city and country, on the mainland and on islands, and in both populated and wilderness areas.

It is not right to allege that although He said these things He failed to bring them to fulfillment; for at the first, at the beginning of things--or rather, even now, there are still many who are hated because of their religion, and are driven out of their fathers' homes, but who think nothing of it at all, it being consolation enough for them to suffer so for Christ's sake.

What ordinary man was ever able to do a thing like this? Tell me!

So it was this man, then, the one who made the predictions about the woman,[1] and about the church,[2] and about the persecution,[3] who also foretold that the temple would fall, and that Jerusalem would be taken, and that the city would no longer be the Jews' city as it had been before.

---

[1] See pp. 112-14, above.

[2] See pp. 114-16, above.

[3] Lit., "the war." Eusebius calls the Diocletian persecution a "war" against the church in EH viii. 4. 2. See p. 115, n. 2, above.

If His other prophecies were false and have never been fulfilled, then don't believe this one. But if the gates of hell have not prevailed against the Church, and if the woman's deed is spoken of throughout the world even after so long a time, and if those who have believed in Him have honored Him above fathers and wives and children--if you see these prophecies conspicuous in their fulfillment, and becoming more and more so every day, then why, pray tell, do you distrust only that one prophecy which deals with Jerusalem?

Especially when the testimony of time should be enough to curb your shamelessness.[1] For if it were but ten years since Jerusalem was taken, or twenty, or thirty, or fifty, even so you would have no right to be so audacious; even though, admittedly, those who wished to be difficult would have been left with some excuse. But if the time that has elapsed since then is not fifty years merely, or a hundred, but twice this much, and three times as much, and even more, during which neither trace nor shadow has once been seen of the change you expect, why, without rhyme or reason, do you act so shamelessly?

The Jews and Old Testament Prophecy Sec. 4

What has been said so far is sufficient to prove to you that the temple will never be built again. However, because there is such a copious supply of truth, I shall leave the gospels and turn to the prophets (in whom especially, the Jews are reputed to believe) and make it clear from them also that the Jews will never get either the city or the temple back again.

---

[1] Lit., "the testimony of time curbs your shamelessness." That this cannot be the sense is evident from what follows. The Jews had not been silenced by the testimony of time.

The Burden of Proof Lies with the Jews.--This is not to say, of course, that the burden of proof rests with me to show that the temple will never rise again. It's not my job to do this, but theirs to show the opposite, that it will be restored. For while I have the evidence of time on my side, endorsing my position, the very outcome of events has defeated them. They have no facts to support their claims. Although they are bound by rights to furnish evidence, all they do is make empty boasts.

Anything I say I substantiate from the actual course of events, from the facts that the city fell and that it has not been rebuilt in all this time; but what they say is nothing more than their own unsupported words. That they ought to supply evidence that the city will rise again is seen in the way trials are conducted in the courts. Whenever people have a dispute over something or other, if one of them produces documentary proof for his position and the other person attacks it, this second person is required to furnish witnesses, or other specific proofs, that the facts are not as the documents make them out to be. It is not the person who adduces the documents who is required to do this.

Here is what the Jews ought to do now; they ought to produce a prophet for us who says that the city positively will be restored.

For if your present captivity were, indeed, going to have an end, it is clear to anyone who has glanced at the prophetic books at all that there would have been every necessity for the prophets to have predicted it; for it was an ancient custom among the Jews for the prophets to reveal ahead of time both the good and the bad that was going to happen to them.

Why Predictions Were Given.--Why did the prophets do this? What was the reason? Because of the Jews' great folly and impudence; because they so promptly[1] forgot God and His favors to them and ascribed all events, even blessings, to the demons. When the sea was divided as they left Egypt,[2] and when the other wonders occurred, they forgot the God who had performed them and attributed everything to those who are not gods, and said to Aaron, "Make us gods, who shall go before us."[3] They appeared also to Jeremiah and said, "As for the word which you have spoken to us in the name of the Lord, we will not listen to you. But we will do everything that we have vowed: burn incense to the queen of heaven and pour out libations to her, as both we and our fathers, our kings and our princes, have done . . . for then we had plenty of food, and prospered and saw no evil. But since we left off[4] burning incense to the queen of heaven and pouring out libations to her, we have all lacked, and have been consumed by the sword and by famine."[1]

---

[1] Greek, παραυτά. The sense may be, "they forgot God, even while the blessings were being conferred."

[2] Ex. 14.

[3] Ex. 32:1 RSV.

[4] The Greek word, διελίπομεν, present in the LXX at this point, is missing from Migne, but is present as διελείπομεν in V560 and P804.

It was so they would ascribe nothing that happened to idols,
but believe instead that both punishment and favor came to them from 60
God, on account of sin or as a result of goodness respectively, that the prophets told them in advance what was going to happen.

To see that this is the reason for prophecy, listen to the 1
ringing voice of Isaiah. "I know that you are obstinate," he says, addressing[2] the Jewish people, "and that your neck is an iron sinew" (that is, rigid) "and your forehead brass" (in other words, "shameless"--we, too, have a custom of calling people "brassy"[3] who don't know how to blush), "and that I declared to you," he goes on, "what is to come upon you, and before it came to pass, announced it to
you." Then, giving the reason for prophecy, he adds, "Lest you should 10
say, 'My idol did it; my graven image and my molten image commanded it.'"[4]

Then, because some of them were quarrelsome and opinionated and even after the fulfillment were as brazen as if they had never heard of the event beforehand, the prophets not only foretold what was coming but also took witnesses of what occurred. Thus the same Isaiah says, "Get witnesses for me, reliable men, Uriah the priest and Zechariah the son of Berechiah."[5] Not only this, but after writing the prophecy on a new scroll he stored it away, so that after the fulfillment the letters themselves would bear witness against them that it had been foretold to them a long time previous. This is why he wrote not simply on a scroll, but on a new scroll, one that would not decompose readily but that would last a long time and remain in existence until the outcome of the events recorded in it.

---

[1] Jer. 44:16-18 (Cf. Jer. 51:16-18 LXX).

[2] Savile and one MS insert here, "inveighing against."

[3] Lit., "brazen-faced," χαλκοπρόσωπος.

[4] Isa. 48:4-5.

[5] Isa. 8:2.

Old Testament Prophecy and the First Three Captivities

That God did in truth tell the Jews in advance everything that was going to happen, I shall prove, not only from this passage, but also from the good and evil things that have happened to them.

Sec. 5 The Jews endured three periods of severe servitude, and not one of these did God inflict without giving a prophetic warning. God saw to it that the Jews were told everything in advance, foretelling the place, time, character, and form of the oppression, their return home, and everything else with precision. The first one I will discuss is the one[1] in Egypt.

The Egyptian Servitude.--Talking to Abraham, God said, "Know of a surety that your descendents will sojourn in a land that is not theirs, and will be enslaved there, and will be oppressed for four hundred years. But I will bring judgment," says the Lord, "on the nation which they serve, . . . and they shall come back here in the fourth generation . . . with great possessions."[1]

---

[1] Migne has πρόρρησιν in brackets. V560 and P804 have the same word.

In this passage you see how He gives the number of years, "four hundred years," and the nature of the slavery, not merely, "they will be enslaved," but in addition to that, "they will be oppressed." Now hear how Moses describes this oppression as it actually occurred:[2] "No straw is given to your servants, yet they say to us, 'Make bricks.'"[3] And they were beaten every day,[4] so 50 you could see what it means when it says, "They will be enslaved, and will be oppressed."

In the words, "I will bring judgment on the nation which they serve," God is referring to the drowning of the Egyptians in the Red Sea, which Moses describes in his songs when he says, "The horse and his rider he has thrown into the sea."[5] And regarding the manner of their return, that they would "march out hither with great possessions," "Each person," says Moses, "shall ask his neighbor, and the person who sojourns in his house, for gold and silver jewelry."[6] For because they served so long a time without receiving their pay, God provided that their wages should be wrung from the Egyptians against their will. And the prophet proclaims, "He led them forth with silver and gold, and there was no sick person among their tribes."[1]

---

[1] Gen. 15:13-14, 16. Verse 16 is quoted freely.

[2] The words, "as it actually occurred," have been added in translation.

[3] Ex. 5:16 RSV.

[4] The unquoted portion of Ex. 5:16 LXX, as also verse 14, says that the foremen were beaten, but neither passage says that they were beaten every day.

[5] Ex. 15:1 RSV.

[6] Ex. 3:22. In the LXX this statement is directed to women, but Chrysostom changes the gender of certain words to the masculine, and "woman" to "each one."

So there is one servitude that was foretold in detail with every exactness. Let us now take up the account of another.[2]

The Babylonian Captivity.--Which one? The Babylonian. For Jeremiah describes it accurately in advance when he says, "Thus says the Lord, 'When the seventy years in Babylon are about to be completed, I will visit you, and I will fulfill to you My good promise to bring you back to this place. . . . And I will turn your captivity and gather you from all the nations and all the places, where I have dispersed you,' says the Lord, 'and I will bring you back to the place from which I sent you into exile.'"[3]

Do you see how here, as before, God specifies the city, and the number of years, and the places from which and to which He intends to gather them? This explains why Daniel offered his intercession for them no earlier than he did, waiting until he saw that the seventy years had been fulfilled. Who says this? Daniel himself. "And I, Daniel," he says, ". . . went about the king's business; and I was amazed at the vision and there was no one who understood it. . . . And I perceived in the books the number of years which, according to the word of the Lord to Jeremiah the prophet, must pass for the desolation of Jerusalem, namely seventy years. Then I turned my face to the Lord God, seeking Him by prayer and supplication, with fasting and sackcloth and ashes."[1]

---

[1] Ps. 105:37 (Ps. 104:37 LXX).

[2] Some MSS read, "of a second one."

[3] Jer. 29:10, 14. The Greek for verse 10 is very close to Jer. 36:10 LXX. The Greek for verse 14 is missing from Jer. 36 LXX but is similar to Deut. 30:3 LXX.

You have heard, now, how this servitude was described, and how the prophet did not dare to offer his solemn and earnest supplication to God before the stipulated time had arrived, for fear that his approach would be totally unavailing, and that he would hear what Jeremiah was told: "Do not pray for this people, and do not make any request for them, . . . because I will not hear you."[2] But when he knew the sentence had been served, and that the moment was calling for the return home, it was then that he prayed, and in no ordinary manner at that, but with fasting and sackcloth and ashes.

Daniel's Manner of Praying.--In dealing with God Daniel made use of a practice that is common in human relationships. When we see someone imprisoning his slaves after they have been guilty of numerous serious offenses, we don't enter a plea for the slaves right away, at the very start of their punishment; we allow a few days to bring them to their senses, and then we call on the masters in their behalf, knowing that by now we have time on our side. This is exactly what the prophet did. After the Jews had suffered punishment--not as much as their sins deserved, but some punishment all the same--he then approached God and lodged his appeal in their behalf. And if you like, let us hear his actual prayer: "I confessed, saying, 'O Lord, the great and terrible God, who keepest Thy covenant and Thy mercy with those who love Thee and keep Thy commandments, . . ."[1]

---

[1] Dan. 8:27; 9:1-2.

[2] Jer. 14:11-12, quoted freely.

What are you doing, Daniel? You are interceding for men who have sinned and given offense, and yet you mention those who obey His laws. Do those who break God's laws deserve mercy?

"No," he replies, "I am not making these men the basis of my plea. My plea is based on their earliest forefathers, on Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, those ~~to~~ whom the announcement and the promise were given, men who furthermore obeyed God's commandments. It is precisely because my contemporaries have no right to any deliverance that I mention their fathers."

And so you will not suppose that he is making that statement about the Jews of his own day, after saying, "who keepest Thy covenant and Thy mercy to those who love Thee and keep Thy commandments," he adds at once, "we have sinned, we have behaved lawlessly, we have done wrong, we have committed sacrilege, we have turned aside from Thy commandments and from Thine ordinances, we have not listened to Thy servants the prophets."[2]

There is only one defense left for sinners after they have sinned, and that is to confess their sins. Contrast with me the moral excellence of this righteous man and the insensitive

---

[1] Dan. 9:4.

[2] Dan. 9:5-6.

blindness[1] of the Jews.[2] Though conscious of no evil within himself, Daniel nonetheless condemns himself with great severity. "We have sinned," he says, "we have behaved lawlessly, we have done wrong." But the Jews,[3] who are filled with sins past numbering, do the opposite, and say, "We have kept Thy charges, . . . and we now call strangers blessed." In this way "those who do unlawful things exalt themselves,"[4] in harmony with the usual custom according to which upright men are modest after performing a worthy act, and 20
wicked men are inflated after committing sins. While the one, conscious of nothing evil within himself, says, "We have behaved lawlessly, we have turned aside from Thy commandments," the others, though aware of innumerable sins, say, "We have kept Thy commandments."

I tell you this so you will emulate the conduct of the one and avoid that of the others.

After he had gone over[5] their transgressions, Daniel next Sec. 6
recalled the punishment they had suffered, hoping in this way also[6]

---

[1] Lit., "ignorance."

[2] The distinction here, implicit though it is, between Daniel and "the Jews," is a commentary in itself on Chrysostom's adherance to the Old Testament along with his rejection of the Jews.

[3] Or, "the masses."

[4] Mal. 3:14-15, quoted freely. The words, "in this way," inserted without benefit of quotation marks, have been added in translation.

[5] Or, "had denounced." The Greek is κατέδραμεν.

[6] That is, in addition to mentioning the patriarchs.

to move God to show mercy instead.[1] "It is because we sinned," he says, "that there came upon us the curse which is written in the law of Moses, the servant of God."[2]

What curse is this? Would you like me to read it? If you do not serve the Lord your God, it says, "I will bring a ruthless nation against you whose language you do not understand, . . . and you will be reduced to small numbers."[3]

The three young men in Babylon illustrated this very curse and showed that the form of punishment was due to their deeds when, in their turn, they confessed to God the sins that all held in common, and said, "Thou hast given us into the hands of lawless enemies, most hateful rebels, and to an unjust king, the most wicked in all the world."[4]

Do you see how the statement was fulfilled that said, "You will be reduced to small numbers"?[5] And the other one too, "I will bring a ruthless nation against you"? Daniel alludes to these very statements when he says, "He has brought evil upon us, for under the whole heaven there has not been done the like of what has been done in Israel."[6]

---

[1] Greek, πάλιν.

[2] Dan. 9:11.

[3] Deut. 28:49-50, 60, quoted freely, even though Chrysostom volunteered to read it.

[4] The Prayer of Azariah 9 RSV (Dan. 3:32 Theodotion). Did Chrysostom intend to quote also verse 6, "For we have sinfully and lawlessly departed from Thee"?

[5] That is, there were only three young men.

[6] Dan. 9:12. The Greek, among other variants, reads, "in Israel," instead of "in Jerusalem," as Theodotion does.

The like of what, does he mean?

The eating of little children by their mothers!

Moses foretold it, and Jeremiah reported its fulfillment. Moses said, "The tender and delicately bred woman, whose foot has never trodden on a step because she is so delicate and tender,"[1] will eat forbidden food and will eat her own issue.[2] Jeremiah shows that this very prophecy was fulfilled when he says, "The hands of compassionate women have cooked their children."[3]

But though Daniel has confessed the sins they have committed, and presented the punishment they have endured, he does not ask that they be saved on these accounts. Observe the modesty of a servant! For after admitting that they had not endured anything proportionate to what their sins demanded, and that their faults had not been cancelled by what they had suffered, he thereafter[4] takes refuge in the compassion of God and in His character of human kindness, and says, "And now, O Lord our God, who didst bring Thy people out of Egypt . . . , and hast made Thee a name, as at this day, we have sinned, we have done wickedly."[1] Thou didst not deliver *them* on account of their good deeds, he says, but because Thou didst see their tribulation and distress and hear their cry.[2] In the same way, free us also from our present evils, through Thy mercifulness alone; for we have no other claim to deliverance.

---

[1] Deut. 28:56. The Greek shows several variants from the LXX, notably, "trodden on a step" instead of "set her foot on the ground."

[2] Verse 57 says that she will eat her afterbirth and her children in secret. Similar cannibalism is also predicted in Lev. 26:29 RSV, "You shall eat the flesh of your sons, and . . . of your daughters."

[3] Lam. 4:10. Cannibalism by a mother is reported in II Kings 6:26-29 during the seige of Samaria under Benhadad II of Syria. There was also a similar instance at the fall of Jerusalem in AD 70, recorded in Josephus Wars vi. 3. 4.

[4] The Greek word λοιπόν is missing from some MSS (incl. V560 and P804).

After saying this and lamenting profusely, he proceeds to mention the city, like a captive woman, and to say, "Cause Thy face to shine upon Thy sanctuary. . . . O my God, incline Thine ear and hear; open Thine eyes and behold our desolation, and that of Thy city which is called by Thy name."[3] For after canvassing the people and finding no one able to render God propitious, he takes refuge in the buildings, and brings up the city itself, and calls attention to its desolation; and by closing His argument on this note, he succeeds at last in rendering God propitious, as is clear from what followed.

The Oppression under Antiochus Epiphanes as Foretold in Daniel 8.--Now for what I was saying a moment ago--for it is necessary to return to my theme. I made this digression[4] not lightly or without a purpose, but to give your wearied minds a little rest from continuous exertion. With your permission, then, let us go back to where we were and prove that the evil times which are yet to overtake the Jews were foretold with precision[1] long ago.

---

[1] Dan. 9:15 RSV.

[2] Cf. Ex. 3:7-8 RSV. God says to Moses at the burning bush, "I have seen the affliction of My people who are in Egypt, and I have heard their cry because of their taskmasters; I know their sufferings, and I have come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians."

[3] Dan. 9:17-18.

[4] Dealing with Daniel's prayer, and beginning on p. 129. The sermon now returns to a discussion of the predicted captivities.

What I have said so far has proved that those two periods of enslavement did not befall the Jews without prophecy,[2] they did not occur without warning.[3] There remains now the third enslavement to be discussed, and after that the necessity of showing plainly that not one prophet ever announced any release or deliverance from this present bondage.

What is this third one? It is the one under Antiochus Epiphanes. For when Alexander, the king of Macedonia, died after destroying Darius, the king of Persia, and transferring the sovereignty to himself, four kings arose. Then a long time later rose Antiochus, a descendent of one of these four kings. He burned the temple, desolated the holy of holies, took away the sacrifices, put the Jews into subjection, and brought an end to the whole Jewish way of life.[4]

Sec. 7

All these things had been foretold by Daniel with perfect accuracy, how, by whom, in what manner, where they would happen, what change would be initiated--and the time when they would take place down to the very day! But you will understand this better when you hear the actual vision in which Daniel tells it all in the form of a parable, calling Darius the King of Persia, a ram, the king of Greece, that is, Alexander of Macedonia, a goat, 50 the kings who came to power after Alexander, four horns, and Antiochus himself, the last horn.

---

[1] The Greek for the phrase, "with precision," is missing from seven MSS (incl. P804).

[2] Lit., "came on them attended by prophecy."

[3] Lit., "simply and unexpectedly."

[4] P804 reads "city" instead of "way of life." For the activities of Antiochus Epiphanes against the Jews see I Macc. 1-6 and II Macc. 4-9.

But is is better to hear the vision itself. "I saw," he says, "in a vision, and I was by the Ubal"[1] (calling a certain place by this Persian name). "I raised my eyes and saw, and behold, a ram standing beside the Ubal, and it had tall horns, and the one was taller than the other, and the taller one came up last. I saw the ram charging seaward, and northward, and southward, and no beast 60 could stand before it, and there was no one who could rescue from his power. He did as he pleased and was magnified. And while I was observing,[2] . . ."[3]

Daniel is here referring to the Persian empire, which extended over all the earth. Speaking of Alexander of Macedonia next, he says, "And behold, a he-goat came from the west across the face of 1 the whole earth, without touching the ground; and the goat had a conspicuous horn between its eyes.[4] Then referring to the encounter between Alexander and Darius and to the overwhelming victory which was there won, the goat, he says, "went up to the ram with the horns, . . ." and was enraged, "and he struck the ram" (for it is necessary to abbreviate), "and broke his two horns, . . . and there was no one who could rescue the ram from his power."[1]

---

[1] Lit., "Oubal." The RSV calls it "the river Ulai."

[2] Or, "And I understand." The Greek is ἤμην συνιών in Migne, but ἤμην συνίων in Theodotion.

[3] Dan. 8:2-5.

[4] Dan. 8:5.

Next, he speaks of the death of Alexander and of the succession of the four kings: "But when it was strong, its great horn was broken, and from below it there came up four other horns, according to the four winds of heaven."[2] Then passing to the kingdom of Antiochus, he shows that Antiochus was a descendant of one of these four kings, saying, "Out of one of them came forth a strong horn, which grew exceedingly great toward the south and toward the east."[3] He shows that Antiochus destroyed the Jewish way of life when he says, "And through him the sacrifice was thrown into confusion by transgression, and it took place, and he was prospered. And the sanctuary was desolated.[4] And sin was permitted against the sacrifice"--for when the altar was demolished, and the holy places were trodden under foot, he set up an idol inside, and offered unlawful sacrifices to demons[5]--"and righteousness was thrown to the ground. And he acted and was prospered."[6]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, vv. 6-7.

[2] *Ibid.*, v. 8.

[3] *Ibid.*, v. 9.

[4] Lit., "will be desolated."

[5] According to the accounts in I and II Macc., Antiochus did not demolish the altar. This was done by the Jews after Antiochus defiled it. Neither is there any account that he set up an idol inside the temple. I Macc. 1:54 does say, however, that he "erected a desolating sacrilege upon the altar of burnt offering," which may imply the setting up of an image on the altar itself.

[6] Dan. 8:11-12.

The oppression under Antiochus as foretold in Daniel 11-12.-- Later he returns to speak of the reign of this same Antiochus Epiphanes[1] a second time,[2] and of the captivity, and the taking and desolating of the temple, and here he adds the matter of time. For beginning again with the reign of Alexander, he describes once more at the end of the book all the intervening events, what the Ptolemies and the Seleucids did when they fought with each other, and what their generals did, their intrigues, their victories, their military campaigns, and their battles on sea and on land. Thus he arrives at Antiochus and stops again[3] and says, "And forces from him shall rise up and profane the sanctuary, . . . and take away the continual sacrifice,[4] (by which term he means the succession of daily sacrifices), "and they will bring" into it "an abomination and those who break the covenant" (that is, those among the Jews who transgress the law), "and they will seduce with flatteries" (they will hold on to them and change them);[5] "but the people who know their God will prevail." Here he is speaking about the events in the time of the Maccabees, notably Judas, Simon, and John. "And the men of understanding among

---

[1] Lit., "this same reign of Antiochus."

[2] That is, in chs. 11-12, as against ch. 8.

[3] The word "again" is missing from certain MSS (incl. P804).

[4] Lit., "the persistence/continuance/continuation." Thomson has, "the daily sacrifice." The RSV has, "the continual burnt offering." The Greek is ἐνδελεχισμός, which, in the LXX, translates the Hebrew *tamid*, which in turn, in the Talmud always means "the continual sacrifice."

[5] Or, "they will keep them with themselves and transfer them."

the people will keep up an intelligence for many purposes; yet they
will grow weak by reason of sword and flame" (he is here referring
again to the burning of the city), "and by captivity and plunder for
some days. And when they are weak, they will be helped with a little
help," meaning that in the course of their woes they will enjoy a
respite and be enabled to bear up under the calamities which have
overtaken them. "And many will join themselves to them with flat-
teries, and some of those who are wise will grow weak." He says this
to show that many even of those who stand will fall. And then he
gives the reason why God allowed them to become involved in such
evils. What is this reason? "To refine and select them and to make
them white until the time of the end." The reason God permitted it,
he says, was to purify them and to exhibit those among them who could
meet the test. Discussing next the power of the king himself, he 1
says, "And he will do according to his will, and . . . shall be
exalted and magnified," and adds, referring to his blasphemous dis-
position, "he will speak astounding things against the God of gods--
and he will prosper until the indignation is accomplished," Daniel
says, showing that it was not from his own will but because of the
anger of God against the Jews, that Antiochus succeeded as he did.[1]

Daniel then goes on to tell in another long passage of the
many evils that Antiochus would bring on Egypt and Palestine, how 10

---

[1] Dan. 11:31-36. The Greek is very close to Theodotion but contains some readings found in the LXX instead. In v. 31 it reads "forces," with the LXX, instead of "seed" with Theodotion. In v. 36 it has "God of gods" with the LXX, instead of "God," as Theodotion has. For the oppression under Antiochus see I Macc. 1-6; II Macc. 1-10.

he would return, at whose summons, and of the necessity that forced him. Then Daniel proceeds further and says that the times would change, and the Jews, after going through all of this,[1] would get some help at last when an angel would be sent to their aid. "At that time," he says, "shall Michael arise, the great ruler who has charge of the children of your[2] people. And there shall be a time of trouble such as never has been since there was a nation on earth until that time; but at that time the people shall be delivered, every one whose name shall be found written in the book"; that is, everyone who is worthy of salvation.

But what I am looking for I still haven't proved. And what is this? That God set a definite period of time for these woes also, just as He did for the others we have mentioned, four hundred years in the first case, and seventy in the second. Let us look to see whether He has delimited any certain period in this case as well. And where shall we find it? In what is about to be mentioned next. Sec. 8

For after Daniel heard of these many disasters, the conflagration, the overthrow of their way of life, and the captivity of his people, he wanted to know, in addition, if these things would ever come to an end, and if any change would ever take place.[3] So he asked, "O Lord, what shall be the end of these things? And He replied, 'Come, Daniel, because the words are shut up and sealed'" (alluding to the obscurity of what had been said), "'until the time of the end.'" Then he also gives the reason why these calamities were allowed: Until "many have been chosen and made white and purified, and until the wicked have done wickedly and all the wicked have understood, and those who are wise have understood."[1]

---

[1] V560 reads, "after having suffered all these punishments."

[2] Savile reads, "His."

[3] Lit., "if there would be any change from these calamities."

Then announcing the period of time during which these terrors would prevail,[2] he says, "From the time when the 'continual sacrifice' shall be altered."[3] The daily sacrifice was called the "continual sacrifice" because something that is frequent and perpetual is "continual," and it was a custom among the Jews to offer a sacrifice to God morning and evening every day, and this is why he calls this sacrifice the "continual sacrifice." When Antiochus came on the scene, however, he put an end to this custom,[4] and "altered" it, and this is why the angel says, "From the time when the continual sacrifice shall be altered," that is, from the abolition of the sacrifice, "there shall be twelve hundred and ninety days,"[5] or a little more than three and a half years.

---

[1] Dan. 12:8-10. The Greek contains a striking change from both Theodotion and the LXX, reading, "until the wicked have understood," instead of, "the wicked shall not understand."

[2] Or, "the period that would contain these terrors."

[3] Dan. 12:11.

[4] Cf. Ex. 29:38-42 RSV, "Now this is what you shall offer upon the altar: two lambs a year old day by day continually. One lamb you shall offer in the morning, and the other lamb you shall offer in the evening; . . . It shall be a continual burnt offering throughout your generations."

[5] Dan. 12:11.

Then, to show that there would be an end and a deliverance from these evils, he adds, "Blessed is he who endures and arrives at the thirteen hundred and thirty-five days,"[1] adding now forty-five days to the twelve hundred and ninety. For the assembly at which the victorious cleansing took place occurred within a month and a half after the complete and full deliverance was won from the foregoing evils;[2] and he says, "Blessed is he who endures and arrives 1
at the thirteen hundred and thirty-five days," to make this deliverance plain.

He does not say merely, "He who arrives," but "He who endures and arrives." Many of those who saw the deliverance were ungodly men. He does not bless these in an unqualified way but only those who bore their witness during the calamitous times and did not give up their religion, and who after that attained to the relief. This is why he does not say simply, "He who arrives," but rather, "He who endures and arrives."[3]

Now what could be any clearer? Do you see how the prophet foretold both the captivity and the deliverance from it with perfect precision, not merely to the year and the month, but even to the very day?

---

[1] Dan. 12:12.

[2] This translation assumes that Chrysostom is referring to the cleansing of the sanctuary and rededication of the altar which followed shortly after the defeat of Lysias. I Macc. 1:34-59. The Greek will also support, and perhaps will support better, the translation, "For it happened that the battle at which the unalloyed victory took place and full deliverance was won, occurred a month and a half later." This translation assumes that the reference is to the decisive defeat of Nicanor on Abib 13, some three months (not 45 days) later than the rededication celebration on Chislev 25. I Macc. 4-7.

[3] Dan. 12:11-12.

The Commentary by Josephus.--To show that I am not guessing in what I am saying, let me introduce another witness to what has been said, one whom the Jews regard as thoroughly reliable. I refer to Josephus,[1] who has recited the tragic story of their calamities and has paraphrased the entire Old Testament.[2] He lived after the coming of Christ and has written of the captivity which Christ predicted. He also describes the captivity which had occurred previously, interpreting Daniel's vision about the ram and the goat and the four horns, and the other horn that came up later. But so that none of you will suspect what I have said, let me read his actual words.

After expressing praise and admiration of Daniel in superlative terms and honoring him above all the other prophets,[3] he comes at last to this vision, and says,[4] "He left behind writings in which he has made plain to us the accuracy and faithfulness to truth of his prophecies.[1] For he says that when he was in Susa, the metropolis of Persia, and went out into the plain with some of[2] his companions, there was a sudden shaking and trembling of the earth, and he was left alone by his friends, who fled,[3] and he fell face down, supporting himself on his two hands. Whereupon someone touched him and at the same time bade him arise and see what was to happen to his countrymen in the future after many generations.[4]

---

[1] Baur (op. cit., I, 96-97) says that Josephus War "was industriously read in the school of Diodorus," and that Chrysostom quotes Josephus at least twelve times.

[2] This is a reference, of course, to his work, Antiquities.

[3] Josephus says, "Now it is fitting to relate certain things about this man (Daniel) which one may greatly wonder at hearing, namely that all things happened to him in a marvellously fortunate way as to one of the greatest prophets, and during his lifetime he received honour and esteem from kings and people, . . ." Antiquities x. 266 (cf. also 267-68); trans. Ralph Marcus, LCL, VI, 305-307.

[4] The lengthy extract (from Antiquities x. 269-76) which begins here is given largely as translated by Ralph Marcus in LCL, VI, 307-11, but modified in places, especially where the Loeb text differs from that in Migne. Most of Marcus' notes to this passage

"When he arose, there was shown to him a great ram with many horns growing out of it, the last of which was higher than the rest. Then he looked toward the west and saw a goat flying through the air,[5] which attacked the ram, struck[6] it twice with its horns, hurled it to the ground, and trampled on it. Then he saw the goat taller, it having grown a very large horn out of the middle of its forehead;[7] but when this was broken off, four horns came up, facing each one of the four winds. From these, he writes, there arose and grew another,

---

are reproduced in the footnotes below, as indicated by the name "Marcus" following each one.

[1] Lit., "non-deviation" (from truth).

[2] Greek for the phrase "some of" is not found in the Loeb text.

[3] The earthquake and the presence of friends are unscriptural details. Marcus.

[4] In Scripture Daniel's confusion and the appearance of the interpreter are mentioned only later (verse 17), after the description of the goat. Marcus.

[5] On the basis of his text, Marcus adds, "from that quarter."

[6] Emended text; the MSS read "broke" or "butted." Marcus.

[7] According to Scripture the goat had a great horn before it attacked the ram. Marcus.

smaller horn, which God, who revealed these things to him, told him would make war on his nation, take their city by storm, confound the temple,[1] and prevent the sacrifices from being offered for one thousand two hundred and ninety days.[2]

"This, Daniel writes, is what he saw in the plain of Susa, and he relates that God interpreted to him the form of the vision as follows: The ram, he declared, signified the empire of the kings of the Persians and the Medes,[3] and the horns, those who were to reign, the last horn signifying the last king, who would surpass all the others in wealth and glory.[4] 1

"The goat, he said, indicated that there would be a certain king of the Greeks[5] who would encounter the Persian king twice in battle and defeat him and take away all his empire.[6] The first[7] great horn in the forehead of the goat indicated the first king, and the rise of the four horns after the first horn fell out, and their facing toward the four quarters of the earth, denoted, he said, the successors of the first king after his death and the division of the kingdom among them, and that these, who were neither sons nor relatives, would rule the world for many years.[1]

---

[1] Emending the Greek to read συγχεῖν τὸν ναόν. Migne has συλήσειν τὸν ναόν, "spoil the temple." V560 and P804 read, συσχεῖν τὸν ναόν, "close the temple." Savile and eight MSS, and the Loeb text of Josephus, have συγχεῖν τὰ περὶ τὸν ναόν, "confound the temple service."

[2] Marcus, in an extended note on this time period, fails to observe that his text and translation give the figure as 1296 days, a number which occurs neither in Scripture nor in Chrysostom.

[3] Marcus, on the basis of his text, gives, "the kingdoms of the Medes and Persians."

[4] The text for the last part of this sentence differs slightly from the Loeb text. In either case, the part of the sentence from "the last horn" on is, as Marcus says, an addition to Scripture.

[5] Or, "that there would be someone from the Greeks who would be king."

[6] The last part of this sentence, from "who would encounter" on, is an addition to Scripture. Marcus.

[7] The adjective "first" is not in the Loeb text or translation.

"And there would arise from their number one certain king who would make war (on the nation of the Jews)[2] and on their laws, deprive them of the form of government based on the laws, confound the temple, and prevent the sacrifices from being offered for three years.

"And these misfortunes our nation did in fact come to experience under Antiochus Epiphanes, just as Daniel many years before saw and wrote about, saying that they would happen."

What could be clearer than this? Sec. 9

Old Testament Prophecies Regarding Jerusalem and the Temple Today

And now it is time--unless[3] we seem to be boring--to come to the specific question for which we have first brought up all these other matters, the captivity now in progress, the servitude which exists today.

But bestir yourselves and pay attention to me, please, for this is no contest over trivia! Spectators at the Olympic contests[1] sit patiently from midnight to noon in order to see who will get the wreath. They let the hot sun shine on their bare heads[2] and do not leave until the events have all been judged. How absurd it is, then, to give up--or even to get restless--when the contests are not for an Olympic crown but for the crown of immortality!

---

[1] Here again Josephus amplified Scripture. Marcus.

[2] The words in parentheses are represented in the Loeb text but not in Migne.

[3] Or, with a slight emendation of the text, "lest."

That those three captivities were announced in advance, the one that was four hundred years long, and the others of seventy and of three and a half years[3] respectively, has been demonstrated sufficiently already. So now let me speak further about the present one. And to show that the prophet did predict this one too, I shall call in the same witness again, Josephus, a partisan of the Jews. Listen to what he says following the quotation which I just read to you: "In the same manner Daniel also wrote about the empire of the Romans and said that Jerusalem would be taken by them and the temple laid waste."[4]

---

[1] Savile (with P804) has, "spectacles." Olympic games were held in Daphne quadrennially, apparently on Julian leap years. See Downey, *op. cit.*, p. 505, n. 9.

[2] Lit., "on their naked head they accept the hot rays."

[3] Eight MSS (incl. V560 and P804) have, "and of three years, . . . and only this has been shown sufficiently already." Migne reads, ἡ δὲ τρία καὶ ἡμίσυ, τοῦτο ἱκανῶς ἐντεῦθεν. Others read, ἡ δὲ τρία, καὶ μόνον τοῦτο ἱκανῶς ἐντεῦθεν.

[4] Josephus *ibid*. 276; *LCL*, VI, 310-11. Marcus adds this note: "'Jerusalem . . . laid waste' is conjecturally added from the excerpt in Chrysostomus. Here as in an earlier reference (section 78) to the prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem, R. Eisler, *The Messiah Jesus*, p. 609, and some other scholars suspect an interpolation in Josephus's text. But as Josephus is here summarizing the contents of Daniel 11-12, which his rabbinic

Consider with me now, that even though the man who wrote this was a Jew, he did not have the hardihood to emulate your pugnacity. When he said that Jerusalem would be taken, he didn't dare to add that it would be rebuilt again, or to delimit a period of time. 50
Even though previously he had set days and years for the victory of Antiochus, for the desolation that he caused, and for the duration of the captivity which he imposed, he said nothing of the sort about the captivity under the Romans--because he saw that the prophet had set no time for it. He wrote, indeed, that Jerusalem and the temple would be laid waste, but when[1] that desolation would cease he did not add, because he saw that the prophet had not added it. "All these things, as God revealed them to him, he left behind in his writings," he says, "so that those who read them and observe how they have come to pass must wonder at Daniel's having been so honored by God.[2]

The Prophecy of Daniel 9.--So let us examine now the passage where Daniel says that the temple would be laid waste. For after he 1
had offered that prayer of his which he prayed in sackcloth and ashes,[3] Gabriel came to him and said, "Seventy weeks are decreed[4]

---

contemporaries interpreted as a prophecy of Roman conquest, there is no reason why he should not have mentioned Rome, or to suppose that a mere reference to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans would have been avoided as likely to offend Roman readers."

[1] Lit., "where." The Greek is που.

[2] Josephus, *loc. cit.*

[3] See above, pp. 168-172.

[4] Lit., "have been cut off." Thomson has, "are set apart." The RSV has, "are decreed." The Greek is συνετμήθησαν.

concerning your people and concerning your holy city."[1]

Notice that a period of time is mentioned here too, indeed, but not a period of captivity but a time after which a captivity was to recur again. It is a different thing to speak of a time when a captivity is to be in effect and of a time "after which" it will recur and continue. "Seventy weeks," he says, "are decreed concerning your people." No longer "concerning My people," even though the prophet has just said, "Cause Thy face to shine upon Thy people,"[2] because from now on God alienated Himself in view of the heinous crime they were going to commit.

Next, he gives the purpose: "To finish transgressions and to complete sin."[3] What does it mean, "to complete[4] sin"? It means that though the Jews commit a great many sins, their crowning act of wickedness would occur when they killed their Lord.

Christ says the same thing too: "Fill up . . . the measure of your fathers."[5] You killed the servants, He says; now add the blood of the Master.[6] Notice the agreement between these ideas. Christ says, "Fill up," and the prophet says, "Complete sin," and,

---

[1] Dan. 9:24. The RSV has, "weeks of years."

[2] Dan. 9:17. Theodotion has τὰ ἁγιασμά σου, but Chrysostom has τὸν λαόν σου.

[3] Dan. 9:24.

[4] Or, "put an end to." The Greek is συντελεσθῆναι.

[5] Matt. 23:32 RSV.

[6] Cf. Matt. 23:31 RSV, "Thus you witness against yourselves, that you are the sons of those who murdered the prophets."

"Seal up sins."[1] What does it mean to "seal up"? It means to let nothing remain outside any more. "And to bring in everlasting righteousness."[2] What is this everlasting righteousness unless it is that which is given by Christ?[3]

"And to seal vision and prophet and to anoint the holy of holies";[4] that is, to put a stop to the prophecies from then on (for this is what "sealing" means), and to put a stop to the anointing, and to put a stop to the visions. This is why Christ says, "The law and the prophets were until John."[5]

Do you see how He here threatens a desolation and a requiting of sins and unrighteousness that is absolute? God makes no promise to acquiesce in their sins, but to avenge them!

The "Seventy Weeks" Fulfilled.--And when did all of this actually take place? When were these prophecies completely done away with? When was the "anointing" so destroyed that it could never exist any more? The voice of history[6] is so clear that if we kept still "the very stones would cry out."[7] I cannot mention any other time that answers to these predictions than this very long period the major part of which is still in the future. Sec. 10

Speaking in greater detail he says, "Both know and understand

---

[1] Dan. 9:24.

[2] *Idem*.

[3] Nine MSS (incl. V560) have, "by God," instead.

[4] Dan. 9:24.

[5] Matt. 11:13.

[6] Lit., "of events."

[7] Cf. Luke 19:40 RSV, "I tell you, if these were silent, the very stones would cry out."

that from the promulgation of a decree given as an answer,[1] and for rebuilding Jerusalem, until the anointed Ruler, shall be seven weeks and sixty-two weeks."[2] Pay very close attention to me now, for the 50
whole question lies here. "Seven weeks and sixty-two weeks" are four hundred and eighty-three years, for he is not speaking here of weeks of days or months, but of weeks of years.[3] Now, from Cyrus[4] to Antiochus Epiphanes[5] and the captivity which occurred under him, is only 394 years,[6] which makes it plain--since he extends the time longer--that he is not referring to this captivity but to the one that came after it, the one under Pompey, Vespasian, and Titus.[7] By extending the time period this way, then he indicates the point from which it is necessary to count, and shows that it is not the date of the return from Babylon--but from what? "From the promulgation of a

---

[1] Greek, ἀπὸ ἐξόδου λόγου τοῦ ἀποκριθῆναι. Thomson has, "from the going forth of a word for returning an answer." The translation given above assumes that the passage refers to the decree of Artaxerxes given in answer to Nehemiah's request. See Neh. 2, Ezra 7, and p. 153, below.

[2] Dan. 9:25.

[3] The RSV for Dan. 9:24 has, "seventy weeks of years."

[4] Cyrus, the founder of the Persian Empire, became king of Ashnan in 558 BC, ruling over certain Persian tribes as a vassal of the prince of the Medes. He conquered Babylon in 539 BC and died in battle in 530 BC.

[5] 175-163 BC.

[6] The altar was unusable from Chislev 25, 167 BC, until the same date in 164 BC. See I Macc. 1:54, 59; 4:52. From the beginning of Cyrus' career in 558 BC until the end of the desecration of the altar is 394 years.

[7] That is, the captivity under the Romans.

decree given as an answer, and for rebuilding Jerusalem."[1] 1

Jerusalem was not built under Cyrus, but under Artaxerxes

---

[1] Cf. Julius Africanus Chronography frs. 13, 16, "The most famous exile which the Hebrews experienced, that is, their captivity under Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, lasted for 70 years, just as Jeremiah had prophesied. (Berosus the Babylonian mentions Nebuchadnezzar.) After the 70 years of captivity, Cyrus became king of the Persians at the time of the 55th Olympiad, as may be ascertained from the Bibliothecae of Diodorus and the histories of Thallus and Castor, and also from Polybius and Phlegon, and from others as well who have studied the Olympiads, for the date is a matter of agreement among them all. Cyrus, then, in the first year of his reign, which was the first year of the 55th Olympiad, effected the partial restoration of the people by means of Zerubbabel, . . ." Zerubbabel and the others who went up with him "were prevented at first from building the temple and from surrounding the city with a wall, on the pretext that their doing so had not been authorized. As a result, things remained in this condition until Nehemiah and the reign of Artaxerxes and the 115th year of the sovereignty of the Persians--and from the capture of Jerusalem this makes 185 years. At this time King Artaxerxes issued orders for the city to be built and Nehemiah, after he had been dispatched to take care of this, superintended the work, and the street and the surrounding wall were built as the prophesy had foretold. It is by figuring from this point that we make up seventy weeks to the time of Christ; for if we begin to reckon from any other point rather than from this one, the periods will not correspond and very many odd results will accrue. For if we begin the calculation of the seventy weeks from Cyrus and the first restoration, there will be more than a hundred years too many, and there will be an even larger number if we begin from the day on which the angel gave the prophecy to Daniel--and a much larger number still if we begin from the commencement of the captivity. For we find that the sovereignty of the Persians comprised a period of 230 years, and that that of the Macedonians extended over 370 years, while from then to the 16th year of Tiberius Caesar is a further period of about 60 years. So it is by calculating from Artaxerxes to the time of Christ that the seventy weeks are made up, according, that is, to Jewish reckoning. For from Nehemiah, who was dispatched by Artaxerxes himself, to this date, which was the second year of the 202nd Olympiad and the 16th year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, there are 475 years, which make 490 years according to Hebrew calculations. For the Jews measure the years by the course of the moon with the result, as is easy to show, that the year consists of 354 days as against the solar year with its $365\frac{1}{4}$ days. The solar year exceeds the period of twelve lunar months by $11\frac{1}{4}$ days, and this is why the Greeks and the Jews insert three intercalary months every 8 years. (Eight times $11\frac{1}{4}$ days makes 3 months.) Now 475 years consist of 59 periods of 8 years each (plus three months over). Since there are 3 intercalary months every 8 years, we thus get 15 years (less a few days); and these fifteen

Longimanus. For after the return,[1] Cambyses arose, and then the Magi. After them came Darius the Son of Hystaspes, and then his son, Xerxes. After him arose Artabanus, and after him, Artaxerxes Longimanus,[2] king of Persia. And when Artaxerxes was king, in the twentieth year of his reign, Nehemiah returned and raised up the city.[3] Esdras relates it all carefully for us.[4]

So if we count 483 years from this event, it is quite evident that we shall be brought to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans.[5] This is why he says, "A street shall be built and a

---

years, being added to the 475 years, make up in all the 70 weeks." MPG, vol. X, cols. 74-84. Cf. M. J. Routh, Reliquiae Sacrae (2nd ed.; Oxford: 1846), II, 238-309, 359-509. For the translation, cf. ANF, VI, 133-35.

[1] Cyrus allowed the Jews to return to Palestine. After his death in 530 BC, his son Cambyses reigned in his place.

[2] For a comparable listing in Josephus, see Marcus, op. cit., p. 324, n. b, which, however, omits the Magi and Artabanus. The Magi are mentioned in Antiquities xi. 31.

[3] Cf. Neh. 2:1-5 RSV, "In the twentieth year of King Artaxerxes" Nehemiah asks permission to rebuild Jerusalem, and in 6:15 he reports "the wall was finished." Discovery of the Elephantine papyri, notably AP 30 and 31, has left it almost conclusive that the Artaxerxes of Ezra 7 is Artaxerxes I, whose first regnal year according to Jewish reckoning began in the fall of 464 BC. Thus Ezra's journey to Jerusalem bearing the decree to rebuild the city fell in the year 457, and Nehemiah's trip in the king's twentieth year fell in 444. See Siegfried H. Horn and Lynn H. Wood, The Chronology of Ezra 7 (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1953), pp. 90-91, 104.

[4] In the LXX, II Esdras includes the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. The present division was not made in the Hebrew Bible until 1448, though it was present in the Greek in Origen's day and in Latin translations since Jerome's. See Robert H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament (2nd ed.; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1948), p. 813.

[5] Julius Africanus (see p. 152, n. 1, above) traces the Seventy Weeks from the same beginning but ends them in "the time of Christ"

surrounding wall."[1] Then after they are restored, he says, and get their proper form, reckon the seventy weeks[2] from this event and you will see that the present captivity will never have an end. And to show even more clearly that there is to be no release from the woes which now bind them, he says, "After the seventy weeks the anointing will be abolished, even though there will be nothing in it to be condemned;[3] and both the city and the holy place will he destroy at one time, together with the Ruler who will come; and they will be cut short as in a deluge, with desolations"--there will be no remnant left, no root to sprout again--"even until the end."[4]

Speaking further of this particular captivity, he says, "Incense[5] and libation will be taken away; and in addition to this, there will be a desolating sacrilege against the temple, and at the

---

rather than at the fall of Jerusalem in 70 AD. But Chrysostom's loose sense of history seems to be satisfied with a general terminus sometime within the Roman era in Palestine. Cf. p. 151, n. 7, above, and n. 4, below.

[1] Dan. 9:25, cont'd.

[2] Chrysostom here shifts from 69 weeks to 70. See n. 4, below.

[3] Or, "and there will be no judgment in it."

[4] Or, "with desolations, even till the end of the foreshortened war." Dan. 9:26. The Greek departs in a number of ways from Theodotion, but notably in reading "seventy" instead of "sixty-two." If 70 weeks (or 490 years) are reckoned from 444 BC, the outcome is only AD 47. (In making calculations from BC to AD it is necessary to remember that there is no zero year.)

[5] V560 and P804 read, "Sacrifice."

end of a set time, an end will be made to the desolation."[1] When, 30
O Jew, you hear the term, "an end," why do you look for something
different? "In addition to these things"--what does "in addition
to these things" mean? It means that in addition to the things men-
tioned, that is, to the removal of the sacrifice and of the liba-
tion, there will be some other, greater disaster. And what is this?
"A desolating sacrilege against the temple." The shrine is called
the temple, and the statue which was set up by the man who destroyed
it is called a desolating sacrilege. "And there will be desolation,"
he says, "until the end."

This is why Christ, who appeared in the flesh after Antiochus
Epiphanes, predicted a captivity still in the future and showed that 40
Daniel had delivered a prophecy concerning it. Christ said, "When
you see the desolating sacrilege, which Daniel the prophet spoke of,
standing in a holy place (let the reader understand), . . ."[2] Any
idol, or figure of a human being, was called a "sacrilege"[3] among the
Jews, and this is why He used this symbolic language, at one and the
same time also foretelling when and by whom the captivity was going

---

[1] Dan. 9:27. The Greek shows three variants from Theodotion, two of them striking. Chrysostom speaks here of "incense" instead of "sacrifice" as Theodotion has, but a moment later comments that the "sacrifice" has been taken away. He also adds "in addition to these things," and comments on the phrase, even though it is not in Theodotion.

[2] Matt. 24:15.

[3] Or, "abomination," as in the KJV. See, e.g., Isa. 44:9-20 KJV, especially v. 19, "I have burned part of it in the fire; yea, also I have baked bread upon the coals thereof; I have roasted flesh, and eaten it: and shall I make the residue thereof an abomination? shall I fall down to the stock of a tree?"

to be imposed. And that Daniel was talking about the Romans, 50
Josephus also demonstrated, as I showed you a moment ago.[1]

And so, if the prophets spoke of limited periods when they revealed the other captivities, but far from setting a limitation to this one, said that it would continue until the end, what leg do you have left to stand on?

The Evidence of Three Attempts to Rebuild the Temple

And now, to prove that what I have been saying is by no means false, allow me to produce evidence also from the facts themselves. For if the Jews had never attempted to rebuild the temple, they would have grounds for saying, "We would certainly have been able
to rebuild it if we had ever desired to try." As it is, I will now 1
show that they have tried to do so and have been beaten not once or twice, but three times, so that the crown is incontestibly the Church's, as in the Olympics.

Who were these people, now, who made these attempts? Sec. 11
Those who "always resist the Holy Spirit,"[2] and stir up riots and revolutions.[3]

Under Hadrian.--After the devastation effected by Vespasian and Titus, those Jews[4] conspired together in the time of Hadrian,
trying zealously to regain their former way of life--and failing 10

---

[1] See p. 147, above.

[2] Acts 7:51.

[3] Montfaucon (in V560 and P804) reads, "Where, then, did they make the attempt, these people who . . . ?"

[4] The first part of this sentence is missing in ten MSS (incl. V560 and P804) and in Savile.

to realize that they were resisting a sentence of God's which ordered the city to be deserted for ever. Who can fight against God and win! By resisting the Emperor they obliged him to a policy of annihilation once more. In response, after he had utterly vanquished them, he undertook to wipe out every vestige that remained; and to keep the Jews from committing such effrontery again, he set up a statue of himself.

But realizing that the time would come when even this statue would fall, he determined to mark the city with an indelible[1] brand of inferiority, an invincible[1] evidence of its shame, and for this purpose imposed on its ruins his own name. And since he was called Aelius Hadrianus, he decreed the city to be so named. And from then till the present it has been known as Aelia, from the eponym of the king who conquered and destroyed it.[2]

---

[1] Lit., "incurable."

[2] Cf. the account in Cassius Dio Cocceianus *Roman History* lxix. 12: "At Jerusalem after Hadrian had founded a city in place of the one that had been destroyed, had called it Aelia Capitolina, and on the site of the shrine of the god had erected a new temple to Jupiter, there arose a war of no slight proportions or brief duration, for the Jews considered it a calamity that foreigners should be settled in their city and alien religious practices carried on there." Eusebius (*EH* iv. 6) puts the sequence of events in the same order, however, as Chrysostom does: After the destruction of Bar Cochbar's forces at Beth-her, he says, Hadrian issued a decree utterly preventing the entire nation from setting foot on the country around Jerusalem, or even gazing from a distance upon their ancestral soil. "The Roman city which then arose," he goes on, "changed its name and was called Aelia in honor of the then reigning Emperor, Aelius Hadrianus." F. C. Conybeare has traced Chrysostom's information back to its probable source, Aristo of Pella. F. C. Conybeare. ed., *The Dialogues of Athanasius and Zacchaeus and of Timothy and Aquila* (*Anecdota Oxoniensia*; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898), pp. xxvi-xxxviii.

You have seen the first attempt of those brazen Jews to rebuild their temple. Now look at the one that came next.

Under Constantine.--They tried the same thing again under Constantine.[1] But when the Emperor saw what they were doing, he cut off their ears and led them around everywhere, like runaway slaves and common scoundrels,[2] with the token of their disobedience blazed on their bodies. And by means of their mutilation he made them conspicuous to everyone and warned the Jews all over the Empire[3] never to try such a thing again.

Under Julian.--These first attempts are ancient history by now, though the second is still known to our old men and elders. But what I am going to tell you now is a living memory[4] even to our youngest men, for it happened under neither Hadrian nor Constantine, but under an Emperor who reigned only twenty years ago, within our own generation.

For after Julian had surpassed all kings in godlessness, he summoned all men to idol sacrifices and to the practice of his abomination, and reminded the Jews of their own ancient form of worship, saying, "This is the way God was worshipped by your forefathers." To this the Jews replied by stating--unwillingly--the very things we have been telling you, namely, that they had no right to sacrifice outside of Jerusalem and that they would break the law if they offered any sacrifice on foreign soil.

---

[1] This incident is not referred to by Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, or Philostorgius in their church histories, or by Zosimus in his history.

[2] Greek, μαστιγίας.

[3] Lit., "those who live everywhere."

[4] Lit., "is clear and evident."

"So if you wish to see us offering sacrifices," they said, "give our city back to us, rebuild the temple, let us see the holy of holies once more, and restore the altar, and then we will offer sacrifices again in the way we used to."

Those vile and hardened Jews were not embarrassed to make this request of a godless pagan! To invite his polluted hands to build the holy places! They failed to realize that they were attempting an impossibility; they were unaware that if it had been a man who had destroyed these things it would have been possible to receive them back from a man, but because it was God who destroyed their city, human power is helpless for ever to alter what has been ratified by divine decree.

"What the Holy God has purposed, who can annul? His hand uplifted high, who can turn aside?"[1] Anything that God raises up and desires to see continue in existence, no man is able to destroy; and anything that God destroys and wishes to keep in a state of destruction, no man is able to restore.

Now, you Jews, let us grant that the Emperor had given you the temple and raised up the altar, as you so fondly supposed; would he have been able to release the fire from heaven again?[2] If not, your sacrifice would have been unclean and accursed. This is why the sons of Aaron died; they carried strange fire into the sanctuary.[1]

---

[1] Isa. 14:27.

[2] Chrysostom seems to have believed that fire fell from heaven onto each particular sacrifice when the Old Testament ceremonial was still in effect. See Sermon iv, p. 104, above.

Nonetheless, blind to everything, the Jews kept urging and begging Julian to cooperate with them in rebuilding the temple. For his part he spent money, and sent in work superintendents from his great empire, and called in craftsmen from everywhere, and did everything he could, involving himself in the business to the end that gently and step by step he might incite them to offer sacrifices. His goal was to lead them, unheeding, into the worship of idols, and at the same time he hoped--raving fool that he was--to frustrate Christ's decree which forbade the temple to be restored.

But He who "catches the wise in their craftiness"[2] took occasion from their activity to prove that[3] the judgments of God are mightier than all else, and "the effects of the words of God are full of power."[4] For just as they were coming to grips with this wicked enterprise, and were beginning to expose the old foundations, and had dug out a large pile of earth, and were about to commence the actual building, fire leaped suddenly from the foundations and burned not only a large number of men but even the stones there as well. It stopped the men in charge from carrying on their contumacy. The crowd of Jews who saw it happen were stunned and shamed. And when the Emperor Julian heard about it, in spite of his mania for the project, he feared that by continuing he would call the fire down upon his own head, and so desisted--defeated, along with the entire nation.

---

[1] Lev. 10:1-3.

[2] I Cor. 3:19 RSV.

[3] Reading ὅτι with V560 and P804, instead of ὅτε, as in Migne.

[4] Joel 2:11.

If you go to Jerusalem today, you will see the foundations laid bare; and if you ask the reason why, you will hear no other explanation than the one which I have given.[1]

We are all witnesses of this, for it did not happen a long time ago, but in our own day. Think how striking a victory it really is! It was not won in the time of a godly emperor, when a person could say that Christians came upon the builders and put a stop to their work; it was won at a time when our side was in exile; 50 when it was a hazard for us even to live; when all human courage was removed, and the pagan cause was dominant, and of those who held the Faith, some hid at home, while others left for the deserts and avoided market places. It was in a time like that when all this took place, that no excuse might be left the Jews for their insolence.

The Prophecies about the New Sacrifice

Will you still dispute the point, O Jew, even when you Sec. 12 are confronted with all this incriminating evidence--Christ's prediction and those of the prophets', and the proof that rises out of history? But it is not surprising! Your race[1] has been rude and disputatious from the start, and has always made it a practice to fight against the obvious.

---

[1] This famous incident did, however, receive different treatment in antiquity. Socrates (EH iii. 20) says an earthquake preceded the appearance of the fire and adds that the sign of the cross appeared on many of the Jews. Sozomen (EH v. 22) adds further details about the earthquake, which he too says occurred prior to the fire, and asserts that all accounts of the story agree except as to the source of the fire--whether it sprang from the temple or directly from the earth. Theodoret (EH iii. 20) adds still further prodigies: Excavated soil drifted back into the

Would you like me to arm other prophets against you, who say the same thing plainly? That while your religion was to come to an end, ours was to flourish? And that the preaching of Christ was to spread all over the world? And that a different kind of sacrifice was to be inaugurated when yours had been abrogated?[2] Then listen to Malachi, the prophet who came last, after all the others. For the time being I will not cite Isaiah or Jeremiah or any of the other prophets who lived before the Babylonian captivity, so you won't be able to say that the woes they foretold were fulfilled in that captivity. Instead, I am going to cite a prophet who spoke very clearly about your affairs[3] and who lived after the return from Babylon and after the restoration of the city.

---

trenches at night, a whirlwind blew in, a cross appeared glowing in the night sky, and, he says, the crosses on the Jews' garments were black. Philostorgius (*EH* vii. 9, 14), in addition to referring to the fire, tells of the discovery, in a wet subterranean chamber, of a copy of the Gospel of John, resting above the water on a pillar and open to the first verse of the first chapter. It is noteworthy that the pagan writer, Ammianus Marcellinus (*History* xxiii. 1), ascribes Julian's failure to rebuild the temple to the eruption of fire balls.

[1] Five MSS (incl. P804) have, "Your habit."

[2] Although Chrysostom speaks of the Eucharist as a "sacrifice," in Sermon xvii *On Hebrews* he explains that "we perform rather a remembrance of a Sacrifice," μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνάμνησιν ἐργαζόμεθα θυσίας.

[3] V560 and P804 read, "about current events."

For after they had returned and had regained the city and rebuilt the temple, and when they were celebrating the sacrifices once more, Malachi, as God's spokesman, foretold the desolation, and the termination of the sacrifices, which was future in his day but is present in ours. He said, "'Shall I show you a favor?' says the Lord of hosts. . . . 'For from the rising of the sun to its setting My name is glorified among the nations, and in every place incense is offered to My name, and a pure sacrifice. . . . But you profane it!'"[1]

When was this fulfilled, O Jew? When was incense offered to God in every place, and a pure sacrifice? You cannot say that it happened at any time other than this, after the Advent of Christ; for if Malachi was not referring to this time and to our sacrifice, but instead was referring to the Jewish sacrifice, his prophecy was unlawful! Moses commands the sacrifices to be brought up to no other site than the place the Lord God should select, restricting those sacrifices to one location.[2] So if the prophet says that incense is going to be offered in every place, and a pure sacrifice, he is in conflict with Moses!

But there is no conflict or dispute here at all, for Moses is talking about one sacrifice and Malachi, later on, is making a prediction about another.

How do we know?

---

[1] Mal. 1:9, 11-12. This passage was used very early by Christian writers to refer to the Lord's Supper, such as in *Didache* xiv. 3, and Justin *Dialogue* xli.

[2] See Sermon iv, p. 115, above.

Not only from what has been said, but also from many other indications. For one, from the location; for Malachi prophesies that this service will be celebrated, not in one place alone as the sacrifices were under the Jews, but "from the rising of the sun to its setting." Second, from the character[1] of the sacrifice; for he says that it will be "pure," showing clearly what kind he has in mind. And third, from the people he says were to offer it; for he does not say it will be offered "in Israel," but "among the nations."

And to keep you from supposing that the rituals of this worship were to be restricted to[2] one or two or three cities, he doesn't say merely, "in every place," but "from the rising of the sun to its setting." He indicates plainly that the gospel message is to occupy as much of the earth as the sun shines on.

He talks about a "pure" sacrifice by way of showing that the former sacrifice was impure--not on account of its intrinsic nature, but in view of the attitude of those who offered it. This is why God also said, "Incense is an abomination to Me."[3]

But then, if anyone will just compare this sacrifice with the ones the Jews offered,[4] he will find such an immense, such an infinite difference that he will say with every confidence that this one alone is pure, simply on the basis of the contrast. What Paul says about law and grace, that "what once had splendor has come to have no splendor at all . . . because of the splendor that surpasses it,"[1] we could say confidently about our sacrifice, that compared with theirs, it alone can properly be called pure. For it is not through smoke and smell or slaughter[2] and ransomings[3] that it is offered, but through the grace of the Spirit.

---

[1] Greek, ἀπὸ τοῦ τρόπου.

[2] Lit., "to devolve upon." The Greek is περιστήσεται.

[3] Isa. 1:13. Chrysostom uses this same text in Sermon iv, p. 99, above, and cf. Sermon vii, p. 212, below.

[4] The words, "with the ones the Jews offered," have been added in translation.

Now listen to another prophet who also foretells the same thing and says that the worship of God is not to be confined to one place, and that henceforth all men are to know Him. Zephaniah says, "The Lord will appear to every nation, and He will destroy all the gods of the nations . . . , and they will worship Him, each man in his own place"[4]--even though such a practice was not allowed, since Moses had commanded all worship to be conducted in only one place. So when you hear the prophets foretelling and announcing that men no longer are to be compelled to gather from everywhere into one city or place, but that each one is going to serve the Divinity at his own home, can you ascribe this to any other time than to the present?

Now notice how the gospels and the apostle agree with this prophet. The prophet says, "The Lord will appear," and the apostle says, "The saving grace of God has appeared to all men, training us."[1] The one says, "To the nations"; the other says, "To all men." The former says, "He will destroy their gods," and the latter says, "Training us to renounce godlessness and worldly passions, and to live sober, upright . . . lives." Again, Christ said to the woman of Samaria, "Woman, believe Me, the hour is coming when neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem will you worship the Father. . . . God is spirit, and those who worship Him must worship in spirit and truth."[2] In saying this, He released us thereafter from any need to observe a place, and introduced the higher and more spiritual service.

---

[1] II Cor. 3:10 RSV.

[2] Lit., "bloods." Lampe gives, "shedding of blood, slaughter."

[3] "Redemption" prices or, as the case might be, redemption offerings, were expected for land (Lev. 25:24), slaves (vv. 51-52), tithe (27:30), all the Israelites at the first census (Ex. 30:12-14), and especially for the first-born of men and of domestic animals (Num. 18:15).

[4] Zeph. 2:11.

An Appeal for Action

I could have shown you, in addition, that henceforth there was to be no sacrifice, or priesthood, or royalty, among the Jews. The destruction of the city has, of course, made such points perfectly plain, but I could have called in prophets to tell you about it explicitly. But I see that you have become wearied from the length of the sermon already, and I am afraid that if I go on I shall appear to annoy you to no purpose. I promise, then, to tell it to you at another time.[3]

In the meanwhile I beg this of you, that you will rescue your brothers. Rid them of error. Restore them to the truth. Nothing is gained by hearing a sermon unless you practice what is preached. What has been said has not been spoken for your sakes but for the sake of those who are weak, so they can learn it from you, and escape their evil habit, and manifest a pure and genuine Christianity, and avoid the evil manners and meeting places[1] of the Jews, both in the city and in the suburb,[2]--those criminals' hangouts,[3] those habitations of demons.

---

[1] Titus 2:11-12.

[2] John 4:21, 24.

[3] He fulfills this promise in part in Sermon vii, below.

Don't neglect their salvation! On the contrary, go out of your way and work diligently[4] to restore the sick to Christ, so that in the present life and in that[5] which is to come, we may receive the reward that is much greater than any virtuous action, by the grace and mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom and with whom be glory to the Father, together with the holy and life-giving Spirit, now, always, and for ever, Amen.

---

[1] A rare play on words, διαγωγὰς καὶ συναγωγάς.

[2] Lit., "those in the city and those in the suburb." C. H. Kraeling (op. cit., p. 140) takes this passage to mean that there was more than one synagogue outside the city. The Synagogue of Matrona's at Daphne is mentioned in Sermon i, p. 25, above.

[3] Lit., "the dens of thieves."

[4] Lit., "be meddlesome," πολυπραγμονέω.

[5] Greek, βίος . . . ζωή.

SERMON VI

THE CROSS THE CAUSE OF THEIR WOE[1]

Why an Anti-Jewish Sermon Is Appropriate on a Martyrs' Day

As long as wild animals range in the forests and are not trained to fight people, they are relatively tame and gentle. But when hunters catch them and bring them into cities and shut them up and arouse them to combat[2] with gladiators, once they have leaped out and tasted human flesh and drunk human blood, they cannot be diverted from this kind of food any more, but run to such a meal with great relish.

My experience has been the same. Since I have launched this battle against the Jews, and leaped out against their shameless contradictions, "and demolished their arguments and every proud obstacle to the knowledge of God, and taken their thoughts captive to the obedience of Christ,"[3] my desire to fight with them has somehow increased.

But what am I to do? You can see that my voice has grown weaker and that I am not up to talking so long again. It seems to me that my experience is that of a soldier who cuts down some of the enemy, attacks their line with great gallantry, drops many bodies to the ground--and then breaks his sword, and has to fall back to his own lines in discouragement.

---

[1] The Migne edition carries the heading, "Preached the day following a long sermon against the Jews, when he was hoarse as a result of the length of that sermon."

[2] Some MSS (incl. V560) have, "and leads them out to combat."

[3] II Cor. 10:5.

But rather, my plight is more serious than his. A soldier with a broken sword can snatch another from those who are standing near, put his courage to use, and give evidence of his great eagerness; but when a voice gets tired, one cannot get another voice from someone else. What then? Shall I turn back?

The tyrrany of your love will not allow it.

I respect the presence of the bishop,[1] and I respect your eagerness as well. I shall therefore try beyond my power to make the attempt, casting all on his prayers and on your love.

Though it is the martyrs who have called us here today, may no one condemn this sermon as inappropriate if I overlook the account of their combats and "roll up my sleeves" instead to attack[2] the Jews--for this sermon is more pleasing, even to the martyrs. The martyrs do not become any the more illustrious from our praising them! Why should they require my tongue, whose struggles are above mortal nature and whose reward is beyond the power of thought?[3] They mocked this present life, despised punishment and instruments of

---

[1] Lit., "the father." The reference is presumably to Flavian.

[2] Lit., "strip myself (to attack)."

[3] The Latin interprets this, "beyond my power to express or conceive."

torture, disdained death, were furnished with wings for heaven,
escaped the storm[1] of earthly affairs, and sailed home to a calm
harbor bearing, not gold and silver and costly clothes, but those 1
treasures inviolate, patient endurance, true manliness, and love.
They belong to Paul's choir now, excited by the prospect of their
crowns before receiving them,[2] and henceforth freed from uncertainty
about the future. Why, then, should they stand in need of my words?

Here is the reason this particular topic is more desirable
to them, and why, even though (as I have already said) no increase 10
in their glory accrues to them from our praises, they will derive
great pleasure from a contest with the Jews, and will listen most
attentively to words spoken for the glory of God: The martyrs
especially hate the Jews, for the reason that they love so deeply
the One who by them was crucified. While the Jews said, "His blood
be on us and on our children!",[3] the martyrs shed their own blood
for Him whom they destroyed. Thus they will listen to these words
with pleasure.

The Previous Sermon Reviewed Sec. 2

By showing that all the Jewish captivities--those in Egypt 20
and in Babylon and the one under Antiochus Epiphanes--were imposed
on the Jews in relation to prophecy, I have proved adequately[4] that

---

[1] Some MSS read, "deception."

[2] Cf. II Tim. 4:8 RSV, "Henceforth there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, will award to me on that Day, and not only to me but also to all who have loved his appearing."

[3] Matt. 27:25 RSV.

[4] In Sermon v, above.

if the present enslavement of the Jews were ever going to come to an end, the prophets would have said so in advance, and would not have kept silence. I have shown from the divine Scriptures that for each of these previous captivities both time and place were proclaimed in advance, but that no prophet has prescribed a set period for this current one. Daniel foretold that this captivity would take place, that it would desolate everything and change their way of life, and how long after their return from Babylon it would occur. But that it would come to an end and that its evils would in any degree be checked, neither he nor any other prophet foretold.

Indeed, he foretold the opposite, namely, that this particular servitude would continue to bind them until the end.

The great extent of time which has elapsed since Daniel's day bears witness to his words, a time that has revealed no trace or intimation[1] of a change for the better down to this very day, even though the Jews have tried again and again to rebuild the temple. Once, twice, three times, under Hadrian, Constantine, and Julian, they instituted such an attempt but were held back. Once it was soldiers who restrained their misdirected persistence; later, fire that leaped from the foundations.

The Slaughter of Christ Explains the Jews' Current Distress

I would like now to ask the Jews this question: "Tell me, why is it that after you had spent so long a time in Egypt you got

---

[1] Lit., "prelude."

your country[1] back,[2] and again, after you had been led away to
Babylon, you returned to Jerusalem; and in the time of Antiochus,
after you had suffered so many evils, you went back to the earlier
scheme of things and got the sacrifices back, and the altar, and the 50
holy of holies, and your former dignity,[3] along with everything else;
but that now nothing of this sort has happened at all? A hundred
years have passed, and twice that many, and three times, and four
times, and even more years than that have gone by; it is now five
hundred years from his time till ours, yet not even a hint of this
kind of change can we see anywhere visible. Instead their affairs
have fallen through completely, and do not, even in a dream, provide
any such hope as before. 1

If they should cite their sins as the cause, and say, "It is
because we have sinned against God, and given offense to Him, that
we do not get our country back;" if those who continually feel no
shame when the prophets denounce them, and dissent when they solemnly
lament their murders, should now confess and condemn their sins, I
would gladly ask each one of them in response, "Is it because of your
sins, O Jew, that you are spending so much time in exile from 10
Jerusalem? What is so strange[4] and unexpected about this? Is it so
that only now you are living in sin, and that formerly you lived in

---

[1] P804 reads, "your city."

[2] Some MSS (incl. V560 and P804) read, "they returned to," and have the third person in succeeding verbs also.

[3] Or, "with its former value," that is, as good as before.

[4] Reading καινόν with V560, instead of κοινόν with Migne.

righteousness and virtue? Have you not consorted with numberless transgressors from the start? Didn't Ezekiel the prophet bring a massive[1] condemnation against you by introducing the two harlots, Oholah and Oholibah, and saying, "You built a brothel in Egypt and made love madly with the barbarians, and worshipped foreign gods"?[2] What? When the sea was divided, and the rocks were split,[3] and so many wonders were occurring in the desert--didn't you worship a calf? Didn't you try time and again to kill Moses, now by stoning him, now by striking him, and again in countless other ways?[4] Didn't you blaspheme God continually? Didn't you become initiates of Baal of Peor?[5] Didn't you slaughter your sons and your daughters for the demons?[6] Didn't you display every form of godlessness and sin? Didn't the prophet tell you as God's spokesman, "For forty years I was angry with this generation and said, 'They always err in their hearts'"?[7]

How is it, now, that in those days, even after your childkillings, after your idolatries, after your great arrogance, after your unspeakable ingratitude, God did not turn His back on you but even sent a prophet, the great Moses, to be among you, and kept working marvelous and striking signs? Things which no man had experienced happened to you. A cloud covered you instead of a roof, and a pillar of fire[1] led the way instead of a torch.[2] Your enemies surrendered to you of their own accord,[3] and cities were captured, one might say, with a mere shout.[4] You had no need of arms, or battle line, nor even of a battle. You only blew a trumpet, and the walls came down of their own accord.[5] Your food was unusual and strange, and the prophet exclaimed, "He gave them bread of heaven. Man ate bread of angels. He sent them provisions in abundance."[6]

---

[1] Lit., "denounce you ten thousand times."

[2] Oholah and Oholibah are found in Ezek. 23 RSV, but this statement is not found in that chapter. Ezek. 16 speaks of the building of brothels, but not in these same words.

[3] Cf. Ps. 78:13-16 RSV, "He divided the sea, . . . he cleft rocks in the wilderness, . . . he made streams come out of the rock."

[4] Cf. Ex. 17:4 RSV, "So Moses cried to the Lord, 'What shall I do with this people? They are almost ready to stone me.'"

[5] Cf. Num. 25:3 RSV, "So Israel yoked himself to Baal of Peor."

[6] Ezek. 23:39 RSV, "For when they had slaughtered their children in sacrifice to their idols, on the same day they came into my sanctuary to profane it."

[7] Ps. 95:10 (Ps. 94:10 RSV).

Why is it, tell me, that when you were godless, idolaters, pedicides, when you stoned the prophets and committed ten thousand horrors, you enjoyed such great favor, so much care and protection, from God, but that now, when you do not worship idols, or kill your children, or stone prophets, you live in perpetual captivity? Was God different then from what He is now?

---

[1] The words, "of fire," have been added in translation.

[2] Ex. 13:21 RSV, "The Lord went before them by day in a pillar of cloud to lead them along the way, and by night in a pillar of fire to give them light." Cf. Ps. 78:14.

[3] Notably the Gibeonites. Joshua 9.

[4] So fell Jericho. Joshua 6.

[5] Joshua 6:20 RSV, "So the people shouted and the trumpets were blown, . . . and the wall fell down flat."

[6] Ps. 78:24-25 (Ps. 77:24-25 LXX).

Is it not one and the same God who ordered those things then and who effects these things today?

Why is it, tell me, that when your sins were more grave, God
honored you greatly, but that now, when your faults are lighter, He
has turned His back on you completely and delivered you to continuous
disgrace? If it is on account of your sins that He abandons you now, 60
much more should He have done so then. But if He put up with your
wickedness then, much more ought He to bear with you now, when you
venture no sins of this kind at all.

Why doesn't He bear with you now? If you are ashamed to give 1
the reason, I will state it plainly; or rather, not I, but the very
truth of events itself.

It is because you killed Christ; it is because you stretched
out your hand against the Lord; it is because you shed the precious
blood, that there is now no restoration, no mercy any more, and no
defense. Long ago your audacity was directed against servants,
against Moses, Isaiah, and Jeremiah. If there was wickedness then,
as yet the worst of all crimes had not been dared. But now you have 10
eclipsed everything in the past, and through your madness against
Christ, you have committed the ultimate transgression.

This is why you are being punished worse now than in the past. Indeed, unless this in truth is the reason for your present state of disgrace, why is it that God, who put up with you then, when you were killing your children, turns His back on you today, when you are not attempting this sort of sin any more? It is evident that you ventured a deed far worse than murdering children, or than any other sin, when you killed Christ.

Sec. 3

Tell me, when you see the truth of the matter, so plain, will you keep on calling Him an imposter and a sinner, and not go off somewhere and bury yourselves?[1] If Jesus was an impostor, as you assert, and a sinner, then you ought to have been honored for killing Him. By killing just one man Phineas checked God's entire wrath against his nation. "Phineas stood up," the Bible says, "and made atonement, and the plague abated."[2] Since he snatched so many godless men from the wrath of God with this killing of a single lawless man, how much more should the same thing have happened to you if the One you crucified was indeed a transgressor!

Why is it that for killing a lawless man Phineas was accounted righteous and honored with the priesthood, but that you, after crucifying an impostor, as you say, and a man who was in opposition to God, not only are neither highly esteemed nor honored, but also have suffered more severe punishments than when you were killing your children? Is it not perfectly clear, even to the dullest person, that you are undergoing a severe penalty like this because you have sinned against the world's Saviour and Champion? Whereas nowadays you abstain from blood defilement and keep the Sabbath, at that time you outraged that very day. God, through Jeremiah, promised to spare your city if you stopped transporting loads on the Sabbath,[3] and look, you are complying with this today--you do not transport loads on the

---

[1] V560 has, "hide yourselves?"

[2] Ps. 106:30 (Ps. 105:30 LXX).

[3] Jer. 17:19-27.

Sabbath--but even so He does not become reconciled to you. That one sin of yours was so grave[1] that reference to[2] your other sins is 50 superfluous.

It is not due to anything else in your manner of living than to this one outrageous deed alone, that you experience these present calamities. If this were not the case, God would not have turned His back on you so completely, no matter how many sins you had committed. And this is quite evident, not only from what has been said so far, but also from what I am about to say next.

What is this? We have heard God saying repeatedly to your fathers through the prophets, "You deserved innumerable woes, but I will act for My name's sake, that it be not profaned among the Gentiles."[3] And again, "It is not for your sake that I act, O house of Israel, but for the sake of My name."[4] What He is saying is this, "You deserved heavier vengeance and retribution; however, that no one 1 may say that it is because God is weak and unable to save, that He left the Jews in the hands of their enemies, I lay claim to you and defend you." Hence, if Christ, whom you crucified, really had been an evil doer, even if you had committed endless sins far worse than your former ones, God would still have given you complete deliverance so that His name should not be profaned, and so that Christ should not be considered to have been a great person, and so no one should say that you have suffered this way on His account.

---

[1] Lit., "was greater than all."

[2] Or, "the account that you keep of."

[3] Ezek. 36:21, quoted freely.

[4] Ezek. 36:22.

If, then, it is evident that God overlooked your sins for His glory's sake, how much more would He have done the same for you now, and approved this murder, and blotted out your many sins? But if it appears that He has utterly abandoned you, it is evident from this anger and utter abandonment that He is showing even to the most shameless, that the One who was murdered was not a common lawbreaker, but was the very Lawgiver Himself, and the Cause, present among us, of innumerable blessings.

Thus, you who sinned against Him are in a state of dishonor and disgrace, while we who worship Him, though we were once less honored than any of you, are now established through the grace of God in a more respected position than any of you, and in greater honor.

Proof that God Has Abandoned the Jews

"What is the evidence," someone asks, "that God has abandoned us?"

Is there still a need for argument and demonstration? When the very events are crying out with a voice more piercing than a trumpet, through the razing of the city, and the desolation of the temple, and through everything else that has happened to you, are you still looking for proof in *words*?[1] I ask you!

"But," he replies, "men brought this on us, not God."

No, indeed! God did it. If you attribute this to men, think it over! Men could not have accomplished it successfully if God had not approved it, even had they dared to try. When, for example, that barbarian led an attack at the head of all the Persians,[1] he expected at one sweep to take all. He had everyone enclosed in the city as if in a seine or fishing net. But because in those days, at that time, God was gracious, didn't that enemy--without war, battle, or engagement--leave 185,000 soldiers dead at your feet and flee away, only too glad to escape alone?[2] God has decided countless other wars, too, in this way, on many occasions. And so today as well, unless He[3] had left you once and for all, those who destroyed your city and desolated the temple would never have succeeded. Neither would the desolation have lasted so long. And neither would your many attempts to rebuild[4] have been in vain.

---

[1] The words, "that has happened to you, are you still looking for proof in *words*?", are missing from twelve MSS (incl. V560 and P804).

But I shall attempt to convince you not only from what I Sec. 4 have said thus far but from other evidence as well, that the Roman emperors did not accomplish what they did to you in their own power, but through the wrath of God and His abandonment of you. For if what was accomplished was done by men, your woes ought to have ceased with the capture of the city,[5] and your disgrace to have proceeded no further than that.

---

[1] They were really Assyrians (see the following note), but the territory of Assyria had, in Chrysostom's day, been absorbed into the Persian Empire.

[2] The incident concerned Sennacherib, king of Assyria, in the days of Hezekiah. II Kings 18:13-19:37.

[3] Lit., "unless it were He Himself who."

[4] The words, "to rebuild," have been added in translation.

[5] The words, "of the city," have been added in translation.

Let us assume, as you claim, that it was men who razed the
walls, and men who destroyed the city, and who overturned the altar--
then did men also cause the prophets to cease? Did men do away with 1
the gift of the Spirit? Your other venerated things, did men destroy
them too--the voice that spoke from the mercy seat,[1] the efficacious-
ness of the anointing, and the Urim[2] upon the priest's jewels? For
the Jewish way of life did not take its origins from below; the
greater part, and the most sacred, of its origins came from above,
from heaven.

I will give an example. God gave them permission to offer
sacrifices. The altar, the firewood, the sword, and the priest were
from below, but the fire which used to enter the holy places[3] and 10
consume the sacrifices, had its origin from above. (Men did not
carry fire into the temple; instead, a flame fell from above to ful-
fill the ministry of the sacrifices.[4]) If in those days there was a
need to learn something, a certain voice came from between the cheru-
bim on the mercy seat, predicting the future. And on the jewels

---

[1] Cf. Ex. 17:22 RSV, "From above the mercy seat, from between the two cherubim that are upon the ark of the testimony, I will speak with you," and Num. 7:89 RSV, "When Moses went into the tent of meeting to speak with the Lord, he heard the voice speaking to him from above the mercy seat."

[2] Greek, δήλωσις. Cf. Lev. 8:8 RSV, "And he placed the breastpiece on him, and in the breastpiece he put the Urim (δήλωσις LXX) and the Thummim."

[3] Lit., "those inner shrines."

[4] See Sermon v, p. 204, above. Chrysostom seems to have believed that fire fell on all the sacrifices.

called the Urim which were worn on the highpriest's breast, there occurred a certain brightness which also signified future events.[1]

Furthermore, when there was a need to anoint someone, the grace of the Spirit alighted, and the oil welled up; and prophets ministered these rituals, and a cloud and smoke often covered the shrine.[2]

It was for the purpose, then, that the Jews might not be so recklessly stubborn as to ascribe their desolation to men, that besides allowing the city to fall and the temple to be desolated, He caused these other things to be removed as well, whose origin was in heaven--the fire, and the voice, and the glowing stones, and the other similar things.

When a Jew says to you, "Men made war against us; men plotted against us," tell him in reply, "It is quite certain that men would not have fought you if God had not allowed them to.

"Grant, though, that men did destroy your city wall; did a man prevent the fire from falling out of heaven? Did a man stop the voice heard continually out of the mercy seat? Or the Urim among the jewels? Or the priestly unction? Did a man remove all the other sacred things as well?

"Did not God remove them? Isn't this perfectly obvious?

"And why did He remove them?

---

[1] Cf. p. 180, n. 2, above.

[2] A cloud, and smoke, filled the holy places notably at the dedication of Moses' tabernacle (Ex. 40:34-35) and at the dedication of Solomon's temple (II Chron. 5:14).

"Isn't it plain that He did it out of hatred for you, once and for all abandoning you?"

"Not so," replies the Jew. "The reason we don't have these sacred things is that we do not have a capital city."

"But why don't you have a capital city? Isn't it because God has abandoned you?"

But rather--in order to shut their impudent mouths with even more evidence than enough--let me prove it out of Scripture, that the reason for the cessation of prophecy is not the razing of the temple but the wrath of God and their having provoked Him more greatly today by their passion against Christ than they did when they worshipped 50
the calf.[1] For when Moses was a prophet there was neither temple nor altar, and they kept committing countless acts of godlessness, yet the charisma of prophecy did not depart; indeed, not only this great and noble man himself but seventy others with him were manifested as prophets in those days.[2]

Not only then,[3] but also after the temple had been given to them and everything else needed for worship, and after this, in turn, had been burned up and all the people led away into Babylon,[4] then once more Ezekiel and Daniel--who could not see the holy of holies, or stand beside the altar, but who were in a land of barbarians and among lawless and unclean men--were filled with the Spirit, and predicted the future, and told things much more numerous and strange than those of former times,[1] and saw a divine vision so far as they were able.

---

[1] Ex. 32.

[2] Num. 11:25 RSV, "The Lord . . . took some of the spirit that was upon him and put it upon the seventy elders; and when the spirit rested upon them, they prophesied."

[3] Montfaucon (with V560) has, "not only this." Migne corrects the reading according to Savile and five MSS (with P804).

[4] Montfaucon (with V560 and P804) has, "when in Babylon."

Then why, pray tell, do you have no prophets today? Isn't it plain that it is because God has abandoned you?

But why has He abandoned you? Isn't it clear that it is on account of the Crucified, and because of that bold and lawless deed of yours?

"What is it that makes this clear?" does he ask?

The fact that before the cross, when you were godless, you had everything, but now, after the cross, even though you are reputed to be living a more reasonable life, you endure worse punishment and enjoy none of your former things.

Fulfilled Prophecy Proves the Crucifixion a Crime Sec. 5

So you may learn the cause of your present calamities from the prophets themselves, who present it clearly and explicitly, listen to what Isaiah says, how he predicts both that mercy which was to come to all men through Christ--and your arrogance.

"With His bruises we are healed," he says, foretelling[2] the salvation which came to all men through the cross. Then telling what we are, he adds, "All of us like sheep have gone astray, every man has gone astray in his own way." And speaking of the manner of the crucifixion, he talks in this way, "He was led as a lamb to be slaughtered, and as a sheep before its shearer is dumb, so He opens not His mouth. In His humiliation, His justice was taken away."[1]

---

[1] Or, "than former prophets saw."

[2] Six MSS (incl. P804) read, "intimating."

Where is the fulfillment of all of this to be seen? In Pilate's lawless judgment hall. For when so many things were testified against Him, the Bible says that Jesus[2] "answered him nothing."[3] And the governor said to Him, "Do you hear what these men testify against you?"[4] And He answered nothing but stood silent. This, too, the prophet said[5] long ago: "He was led as a lamb to be slaughtered, and as a sheep before its shearer is dumb, . . ." Then, showing the lawlessness that occurred in that courtroom on that occasion, he says, "In His humiliation, His justice was taken away."[6] No one then judged Him on an impartial basis, but they accepted the false testimonies against Him. His reason for remaining silent was His not desiring to take revenge; for had He so desired, He could have agitated and shaken everything. If, even when He was on the cross, He split the rocks, darkened the world, deflected the rays of the sun, and turned day into night all over the earth, He could have done the same in the judgment hall. But He did not desire to do this, and manifested gentleness and reasonableness instead. This is why Isaiah says, "In His humiliation His justice was taken away."

---

[1] Isa. 53:5-7.

[2] One of the rare times when the name Jesus is used in these sermons, other than in quoted passages and in the terminal doxologies.

[3] Matt. 27:12.

[4] Verse 13.

[5] Six MSS (incl. P804) add, "clearly."

[6] Isa. 53:8.

Then, showing that He was not just an ordinary man,[1] he 50
raises the question, "Who will describe His generation?" Who is this person about whom he says, "His life is taken from the earth"[2]--and about whom (because His life was taken from the earth)[3] Paul says, "Our life is hid with Christ *in God*. When Christ, who is our life, appears, then you also will appear with Him in glory"?[4]

But the thing that I set out to say and to prove, namely, that it is on His account that the Jews endure their present calamities, it is time now to let Isaiah tell you. Where, then, does he say it? After mentioning the judgment hall, and the slaughter, and the ascension, and after saying, "His life is taken from the earth,"
he then adds, "I will deliver up the wicked for His burial fee, and 1
the rich for His death."[5] He does not say merely, "the Jews," but, "the wicked," for what could be more wicked than they, who, after receiving so many benefits, murdered their Benefactor?

If these prophecies have not turned out, and if you are not in disgrace at the present time, and have not been deprived of your entire patrimony; if your city has not fallen, nor the temple become a ruin, nor the woes which have befallen you surpassed every tragedy--then, Jew, do not believe. But if events are shouting and if prophecy has been fulfilled, why, to no purpose or end, be so insolent?

---

[1] Lit., "a man, one of the many." Cf. Sermon v, p. 111, above.

[2] Isa. 53:8.

[3] The words in parentheses have been added in translation, expanding the Greek, διά τοῦτο.

[4] Col. 3:3-4. The RSV has, "your life is hid."

[5] Isa. 53:9. The Greek agrees with the LXX. Thomson has, "I will appoint the wicked for his tomb, and the rich for his death." The Greek, ταφή, can be rendered, "burial fee." Lampe.

Judaism Has Lost All Its Ancient Sacredness

Where are your sacred things now? Where is your high priest? Where are his robe, and the oracular breastplate,[1] and the Urim?

Don't talk to me about those "patriarchs" of yours,[2] those hucksters and traders, men full of wickedness. What sort of priest can there be, pray tell, when that ancient unction is no more, nor any other ritual? What sort of priest can there be, I ask, where there is no sacrifice, or altar, or service of worship?

Would you like me to tell you what the laws concerning the priesthood were in ancient times, so you can see that these men who are called patriarchs among the Jews nowadays are not priests but only pretend to be such, and play as if they were in the tabernacle[3]--or rather, that they are _not_ able to maintain their act, so far have they been separated,[4] not only from reality, but even from the show of it?

---

[1] Cf. Ex. 28:15 LXX.

[2] After the fall of Jerusalem in AD 70, the Jews established racial leaders in Palestine and in Babylonia. The latter was called the "exilarch," and the former, the "patriarch." See the Introduction, above. Kraeling, however (_op. cit._, p. 137), takes the term here to apply more probably "to a provincial official analagous to the metropolitan bishop."

[3] Or, "on the stage." The Greek is ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ.

[4] Lit., "been hurled from."

Bring to mind, therefore, the ritual by which Aaron became a priest in those days, how many sacrifices Moses offered on his behalf, and how many victims he killed; how he washed him; how he anointed the lobe of his ear, his right hand, and his right foot; and how he conducted him into the holy of holies and commanded him to tarry there a specified number of days. But rather, it is better to hear his actual words:

"This," Scripture says, "is the anointing of Aaron, and the anointing of his sons. . . ." The Lord said to Moses, "Take Aaron and his sons and their robes, and the anointing oil, and the young bull for the sin offering,'" and a ram . . . "'and assemble the congregation at the door of the tent of testimony.' . . . And Moses said to all the congregation, 'This is what the Lord has commanded.'" Then Moses led them forward (for it is necessary to abbreviate) and "washed them with water, . . . put on the tunic, . . . wrapped on the girdle, . . . put on the upper garment, . . . over it the ephod, girded him . . . and bound him tight, put on the oracular breastplate and upon it the Urim and the Thummim,[1] . . . and the turban on his head, and on the turban . . . the golden plate." Then taking "the oil . . . he sprinkled some of it on the altar . . . and consecrated it, and . . . on the utensils and the laver and its pedestal, and consecrated them. . . . And he poured some of it on Aaron's head," and did the same to Aaron's sons.

Then he "led out the young bull," and after he had sacrificed it, Aaron and his sons having "placed their hands on it," "Moses took some of its blood and put it on the horns of the altar . . . and purified the altar. Then he poured out the blood at the base of the altar and sanctified it to make an atonement for it."

---

[1] Lit., "the manifestation and the truth."

Then after he had burned some of the calf--some inside and some outside of the camp[1]--he led out the ram in its turn and offered it as a whole burnt offering. Then he presented another ram, "the ram of ordination," and again, "after Aaron and his sons had laid their hands on it" he slaughtered it, "and took some of its blood, and put it on the lobe of Aaron's right ear, and on the thumb of his right hand, and on the great toe of his right foot," and did the same thing to his sons.

Then he took some of the sacrifice and placed it in Aaron's hands and in the hands of his sons, and offered it. Then once more taking the blood and some of the oil, "he sprinkled them on Aaron and on his robes,[2] and on his sons and on their robes, and consecrated" them.[3] And he commanded them "to boil the meat in the court of the tabernacle . . . and to eat it there," "and from the door of the tabernacle of the testimony," he said, "you shall not depart for seven days, until the period is completed, the term of your ordination; for He will ordain your hands for seven days, . . . and thus make an atonement for you."[1]

---

[1] The words, "of the camp," have been added in translation. Cf. Lev. 8:16-17 RSV, Moses burned the fat, the "appendage of the liver, and the two kidneys" on the altar, and the rest "outside the camp."

[2] Eight MSS (incl. P804) have, "his robe." The LXX has, "his robes."

[3] Ten MSS (incl. V560 and P804) omit, "and consecrated them." The LXX has, "and consecrated Aaron and his robes," etc.

When Scripture says that Aaron was ordained with these things, purified with them, sanctified, and with them made an atonement to God,[2] and yet none of them occur any more among you, neither sacrifice, nor burnt offering, nor sprinkling of blood, anointing with oil, nor tent of testimony, nor the designated number of days in which to stay inside, it is quite clear that the Jewish priest today is unordained, and impure, and polluted, and profane, and that he is a provocation to God. For if he cannot be ordained otherwise than by these means, it follows inevitably, when they are absent, that no priesthood exists among the Jews.

Do you see now that I was right when I said[3] that they have been separated and have become far distant not only from reality but even from the very show of it?

Sec. 6 How sacred the dignity of the priesthood was may be learned not only from what has been said so far, but from other evidence as well. For example, when certain foul and abandoned men rose in rebellion against Aaron,[4] assaying to thrust him from the leadership and disputing with him over the honor, the meek and gentle Moses, wishing to dissuade them by the actual facts in the case--that he had not brought Aaron to this position as a brother, or relative, or kinsman, but that he had entrusted him with the priesthood in obedience to the decree of God--he commanded each tribe to provide a rod, and one for Aaron too. Then after they had brought them, he took them all, and laid them down inside. Having done so, he commanded the men to wait for the decision that God would deliver by means of the rods.

---

[1] Lev. 7:25 (LXX); 8:1-34.

[2] Eight MSS (incl. P804) and Savile have, "atoned for Israel," ἐξιλάσατο τὸν Ἰσραήλ.

[3] See p. 186, above.

[4] The incident is given in Num. 17.

Suddenly, while the other rods maintained their original appearance, Aaron's rod alone sprouted and bore both leaves and fruit, so they could see that the Lord of nature was appointing him again and proclaiming the fact with leaves instead of with letters. For the One who said from the beginning, "Let the earth produce the grassy plant"[1] and aroused the earth's power to bear fruit, is the One who also on this occasion made that dry and fruitless wood, without either earth or root, to sprout. Thenceforth that rod was a convincing evidence and witness both to the wickedness of those rebels and to the decree of God, emitting no sound to be sure, yet by its appearance teaching everyone more brilliantly than a trumpet never to undertake such an enterprise again.

Not in this way only, but in another way too, God appointed him yet again. For after many men[2] had formed a conspiracy, ambitious for his dignity (for the position was somehow a bone of contention and greatly desired by many), Moses commanded them to take their censers again, and put incense in them, and await the decree from above. And while they were burning incense, the earth divided and swallowed all of those who had conspired with them, and fire out of heaven burned up those[1] who were carrying the censers.

---

[1] Gen. 1:11.

[2] The revolt of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram is told in Num. 16.

Then, in order that in process of time this event should not be forgotten, nor posterity, as a result, be ignorant of this marvelous decree of God, Moses ordered those censers to be taken and attached to the altar,[2] so that, just as the rod, by its appearance, cried aloud though voiceless, so also those hammered plates should advise, counsel, and reason with everyone who came along later, teaching them, in order to avoid the same punishment, not in any way to imitate the folly of those who had lived before them.

Do you see how the priests were appointed in olden times? Why, nowadays everything among the Jews is a game, and a sport, and a disgrace, and a piece of huckstering, replete with inordinate wickedness. Then, tell me, will you follow these people who are contentious to do and say everything always contrary to the laws of God? And will you run over to their synagogues? Aren't you afraid that a thunderbolt will fall out of heaven and burn up your head? Don't you know that, even though a man is not a robber, if he is found in a robbers' cave, he must suffer the same penalty as the others?

But why talk about robbers? Doubtless all of you are acquainted with and remember the time when certain polluted men and sorcerers in our city took down the statues;[3] how not only those reckless fools but every one, too, who was found to have been present at[1] the scene, were carried off to the court and then led out to suffer the ultimate penalty with them? Are you eager to run to the synagogue, tell me, where the Father is outraged, and the Son blasphemed, and the holy, life-giving Spirit is set at nought? Aren't you afraid? Don't you shudder as you enter[2] those profane and impure precincts? What sort of defense will you have, what mercy will you find, when you push yourself into the pit on purpose, and leap intentionally over the cliff?

---

[1] V560 reads, "He burned with fire from heaven those."

[2] After being hammered flat, they were applied as a covering for the altar. Num. 16:39.

[3] This sentence dates this sermon and the one preceding it at some time later than Lent, 387, when the statues were overturned and Chrysostom's series On the Statues was preached.

Don't tell me that the law is kept there, and the books of the prophets.[3] This isn't enough to make a place holy! Which is greater, that books lie in a place, or that someone utter what is found in the books? Obviously, it is greater to recite what is in the books, and to have it in one's thoughts. Very well then, tell me, because the devil quoted Scripture,[4] did his mouth become holy? There is no other answer, than to say that he continued to be the devil. And what about the demons? Because they preached and said, "These men are servants of the Most High God, who proclaim to you[5] the way of salvation,"[1] shall we on this account register them among the apostles? Of course not; in spite of this we turn our backs on them and hate them as before. Then if recited words do not sanctify, do deposited books do so? How could they? Why, it is chiefly because the synagogue contains the law and the prophets that I hate it; in fact, I hate the synagogue more than if it didn't have any of these books.

---

[1] Instead of "and were present at," V560 and P804 read, "and passed by."

[2] Lit., "as you introduce yourself into."

[3] This same argument is discussed in Sermon i, pp. 21-27, above.

[4] In the temptation in the wilderness, the devil quoted Ps. 91:11-12, "He will give his angels charge of you."

[5] V560 and P804 (with codex Alexandrinus and many Byzantine MSS of the New Testament) read, "to us."

And why? Because it makes the place so much more attractive and deceptive to simple folk. Paul cast out the demon more because it spoke than if it had kept silent.[2] "Paul was annoyed," the Bible says, "and said to the spirit, . . . 'Come out of her.'" And what was the reason? Because it cried out, "These men are servants of the Most High God."[3] When the demons kept silent they were not so treacherous, but when they spoke they were likely to beguile and seduce many of the more simple people to pay attention to them in other matters also.

In order to open a door for their deceptions and give great force to their lie, they mixed in a certain amount of truth, just as men who prepare poisons wipe the lip of the cup with honey to make the harmful substance acceptable. This is why Paul was especially troubled and eager to silence them, because they were appropriating to themselves a dignity which did not belong to them. This is why I, in turn, hate the Jews, because while breaking the law they hang on to it and use it in their attempt to ensnare the simple.

---

[1] Acts 16:17 RSV.

[2] Lit., "When it spoke rather than when it kept silent."

[3] Acts 16:18, 17.

They would not be so culpable if they disobeyed Christ while not believing the prophets; but as it is, they are deprived of all mercy, because they claim to believe the prophets even while outraging the One whom they prophesied.

Actually, if you think that the place is holy because the Sec. 7 law is kept there, and the books of the prophets, it is time for you to reckon idols and idol temples as holy. Well, on a certain occasion when the Jews were at war, the people of Ashdod won, and having captured the ark, carried it into their own temple.[1] Now, was the temple holy because it contained the ark? Not at all. It was still profane and impure, as certain events proved immediately. For to let the enemy see that the defeat of the Jews was not due to the weakness of God but to the sins of those who worshiped Him, the captured ark which they had taken manifested its native strength on foreign soil, twice hurling the idol to the ground and breaking it in two. So far was it from sanctifying the place that it fought against it!

But then, what kind of ark is it that the Jews have today,[2] when there is no mercy seat any more, no unction, no tables of the covenant, no holy of holies, no veil, no high priest, no incense, no burnt offering, no sacrifice, nor any of the other things that once made the former ark sacred?

---

[1] This incident is recorded in I Sam. 4-7.

[2] The chest in which the sacred writings are preserved in a synagogue is called an ark.

To me, this modern ark today seems no better than the little boxes that are offered for sale in the markets--or rather, to be much inferior to them. For they cannot hurt those who approach them, but this one harms every day those who approach it. 40

An Appeal to Shun the Old Temple, To Become a New One, and to Help Others Do the Same

"Brethren, do not be children in your thinking, but in evil be babes."[1] Free those who are agitated by these concerns from their misdirected anguish, and teach them what they ought to fear and be afraid of--not this ark, but ruining God's temple by attending the synagogue,[2] by paying attention to Judaism by holding an observance outside the appointed time. For "you who would be justified by the law," the Bible says, "have fallen away from grace."[3]

This is what you ought to fear; lest on that Day you hear the 50
One who is to judge you say, "Get away. I do not know you.[4] For you fellowshipped with those who crucified Me, and contending with Me, you revived the festivals which I had terminated. You ran to the synagogues of the Jews, who sinned against Me. And whereas I destroyed the temple and turned that sacred edifice and its awesome contents into a ruin, you reverenced buildings which are no better than taverns or robbers' dens."

For if at the time when the cherubim and the ark were in 1 existence, and when yet the grace of the Spirit appeared openly,[1] Christ said once, "You have made it a den of robbers,"[2] and again, "a house of trade,"[3] in view of their lawlessness and depravity, now when the gift of the Spirit has departed from them and all those sacred things have been removed, and when, defying God,[4] they keep celebrating their unlawful worship, how can a person find a suitable name to apply to their synagogues? For if their place of worship was a den of robbers in those days, when what pertains to their way of life still prevailed, if a person should call it a brothel today, or a criminal's hangout, or a resort of demons, or a citadel of the devil, or the ruin of souls, or a cliff and a pit of complete destruction, or any other name whatever, he would speak more kindly than the place deserves.[5] 10

---

[1] I Cor. 14:20.

[2] Lit., "on account of running there."

[3] Gal. 5:4.

[4] Apparently a montage of Matt. 7:23; 25:12; Luke 3:25, 27.

Do you want to see a temple? Then don't run off to a synagogue, but become a temple yourself! God destroyed one temple in Jerusalem, but He has raised up an immense number of other temples far more sacred than it was. "For you are the temple of the living God."[6]

Embellish this house. Remove every evil argument, so that

---

[1] Or, "flourished."

[2] Matt. 21:13.

[3] John 2:16.

[4] Lit., "being contentious against God." Montfaucon has, "dear to God," referring to the sacred things.

[5] V560 and P804 have, "he would still be saying what the place deserves." For a similar description of a synagogue, cf. Sermon i, p. 10, above.

[6] II Cor. 6:16.

you can become an honored member of Christ. So that you can become 20
a temple of the Spirit.

And make other people be the same. When you see a poor man you don't pass him by without concern; so when you see someone going to the synagogue, don't ignore him either, but detain him with a word as with a bridle, and lead him back to church. This particular almsgiving is worth more than the other, and the profit from it is worth more than a vast amount of money.

But why do I say, "than a vast amount of money"? And even, 1
"than all the visible world"? Because a man is worth more than all the world, since it was for him that heaven and earth and the sea were made, and the sun and the stars. Take into account, then, the value of a saved man, and do not neglect his care. For even if a person paid down an immense fortune, he would accomplish nowhere near as much as the one who saves a soul, and brings him home from his wandering, and leads him back to true religion. The person who
gives alms to a poor man relieves hunger, but the one who restores 10
a Judaizer stops irreligion. The one alleviates poverty, but the other stops sinfulness. The one delivers the body from pain, but the other goes further and rescues the soul from Gehenna.

I have disclosed the treasure; now don't you forego the profit. There is no basis here for you to plead poverty as an excuse, or allege your beggary; the only cost is words and the only expense is arguments.

So let us not be sluggish, but with all zeal and readiness let us hunt out our brothers and attract them to our homes in spite

of themselves. Let us serve them a meal and share our table with 20
them today, so that, bringing their fast to an end before our eyes and providing us with adequate evidence and proof of their noble reformation, they may obtain the everlasting blessings both for themselves and for us, through the grace and lovingkindness of our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom and with whom be glory to the Father, together with the Holy Spirit,[1] now and always, and for ever and ever, Amen.

---

[1] V560 reads, "with the Holy Spirit, glory, power, honor, and worship for ever."

SERMON VII

CHRIST AND MELCHIZEDEK[1]

Without Jerusalem, the Jews Have Neither Priest nor King

Have you had all you want of the battle against the Jews? Or would you like me to take up the same topic again today?

Although I have said a great deal already, I believe you would like to hear the same subject treated again, for anyone who never gets too much of loving Christ will never get too much of fighting those who hate Him. Even apart from this, this sermon is a necessity for you anyway, because the series of Jewish festivals is not yet quite over.[2] And just as the Jewish trumpets were more lawless than those in the theaters, and their fasts[3] more disgraceful than any drunken revel, so the tents they are now in process of pitching, are no better than inns where there are prostitutes and flute girls.

Let no one condemn this remark as irresponsible, for it is the ultimate in irresponsibility and wickedness not to regard them with such suspicion. So long as they carry on as they do, stubbornly

---

[1] The Migne text gives the simple title, "Sermon Seven Against the Jews."

[2] Cf. Sermon i, p. 3, n. 3, above.

[3] The Greek is plural.

opposing God and resisting the Holy Spirit, what other choice is
left than to pronounce such a sentence against them?

This very festival was worthy of respect once upon a time--
when it was done according to law, and when God commanded it; but not 50
any more! Its entire status has been removed as a result of its com-
ing to be contrary to God's will. Those who have the reputation
above all for keeping the law and the ancient festivals are, beyond
doubt, the ones who are outraging them both. We are the ones who
really honor the law the most, who treat it like an old man--whom
we allow to rest, and do not drag out, gray hairs and all, to the
wrestling pits to engage in a match when he has passed his prime.[1] 30

I have already said enough to prove that the time for the law
and the old way of life has passed away; today, therefore, let us
look into the items which remain. The evidence I took from all the
prophets, which showed that it is an unlawful and sacrilegious act
to perform any part of the Jewish ritual outside of Jerusalem,[2] was
enough in itself to settle the matter. Even if they really were
going to get their city back, as they keep vaunting and whispering
everywhere, they would still not be acquitted on this basis from the
charge of lawlessness. But I proved in addition, giving evidence 40
beyond what was enough, that their city will never be reestablished
and that they will not regain their way of life.[3]

With this demonstrated, everything else is admitted; for

---

[1] Greek, παρὰ καιρόν.

[2] See Sermon iv, pp. 90-102, above.

[3] See Sermon v, pp. 108-167, above.

example, that no type of sacrifice, no burnt offering, no authority derived from the law, nor any other item in their way of life can exist any longer. First the law ordered every male to go up to the temple three times a year;[1] with the temple now destroyed, this can- 50
not occur. Next the law required a man who had had an emission, or a leper, or a woman who had had her monthly period, or a mother who had just given birth to a baby, to offer sacrifices[2]--and this, too, is impossible today, since there is now no place in which to do it, and no altar to be seen. The law commanded them to sing sacred hymns, and I have shown[3] also that this has been withheld from the place. I have also presented the prophets complaining that "They have read the law and appealed for a confession outside of Jerusalem."[4] If, then, it was not permitted to read the law out- 1
side of the city, how can it be possible to practice it outside the city?

As a result, He threatened them and said, "I will not punish your daughters when they play the harlot, nor your brides when they commit adultery."[1] Why is this? After I have read you an ancient law, I shall attempt to explain.

---

[1] Ex. 23:14-17.

[2] See Lev. 12, 14, 15. However, the law did not require a sacrifice of a man after an ordinary emission, or of a woman after her regular period.

[3] This argument is not found in any of the extant sermons of this series unless this is a reference to Sermon i, p. 29, above, "'Take away from Me,' He says, 'the noise of your songs.'" The Greek is ἀπὸ τοῦ τόπου κωλυόμενον.

[4] Lit., "outside," or "publicly." Amos 4:5 LXX. Cf. Thomson, "for having publicly read a law they proclaimed thanksgivings." This argument is not found in any of the extant sermons of this series.

What, then, is this law?

"If a woman sins" against her husband, "and takes no notice of him at all, and if someone has had intercourse with her, and it is hidden from the eyes of her husband, . . . and there is no witness against her, and she is not caught in the act; and if a spirit of jealousy comes over him, . . . even though she is not defiled, . . ."[2]

What it is saying is that if a woman has committed adultery and her husband suspects it, or if she has not done so and yet he is suspicious, and there is no witness nor any conception to incriminate her, "he will lead her . . . to the priest," the law says, "and will offer her gift . . . of barley meal."

Why, may I ask, is it not the finest grade of wheat flour,[3] *wheat* meal instead of "barley meal"? Because the occasion is one of mourning, or condemnation, and of the gravest evil, and so the form of their sacrifice resembles their calamity.[4] Because of this the law says, "You[5] shall not pour oil on it, nor lay frankincense on it. . . . Then" (for it is necessary to abbreviate) "the priest shall bring her forward . . . and shall take clean . . . water in an earthenware jar, and shall pick up some dust from the floor . . . and put it in the water. And . . . he shall present the woman . . . and shall make her take an oath, and shall say, . . . 'if you have not sinned against your husband so as to be defiled, be safe from this water of conviction . . . ; but if you have sinned . . . and are defiled, having engaged in intercourse with anyone other than your husband, . . . the Lord make you a curse and an imprecation among your people.'"

---

[1] Hos. 4:14 RSV.

[2] Num. 5:12-14.

[3] Cf. Lev. 2:1 RSV, "When any one brings a cereal offering as an offering to the Lord, his offering shall be of fine flour." The LXX has, "of the finest grade of wheat flour."

[4] Or, by emending οἰκείας to οἰκίας (with P804), "the calamity of their household."

[5] Some MSS (incl. P804) read, "He."

What does "a curse and an imprecation" mean? It means that people will say, "May I not suffer as such and such a woman suffered!"

"'When the Lord causes . . . your abdomen to swell,'" the priest goes on, "'this water over which this imprecation is made shall enter . . . and bloat[1] your womb. . . .' And the woman shall say, 'So be it, so be it.' And it shall be so, that if she is defiled . . . , the water of conviction will enter, and will bloat[1] her womb, . . . and the woman will be a curse. But if the woman is not defiled, . . . she will be safe and will conceive a child."[2]

But because, after they had gone into captivity, none of this could take place--since there was neither temple, nor altar, nor tabernacle, nor the offering up of sacrifices, he threatened them and said, "I will not punish your daughters when they play the harlot, nor your brides when they commit adultery."[3]

---

[1] Following the reading πρῆσαι . . . πρήσει in the LXX and in P804. Migne has, "grind," πρίσαι . . . πρίσει.

[2] Num. 5:15-28. [3] Hos. 4:14 RSV, quoted also on p. 202, above.

Do you see that the law derives its validity from the place? Sec. 2

That there cannot be a priest, either, when there is no city, is clear from what follows, namely, that just as there cannot be a kingdom when there is no army, diadem, purple robe, or any of the other things which constitute royalty, so it is impossible for there to be a priest when the sacrifices have been removed, the offerings withheld, the holy things profaned, and the entire pattern obliterated, because it was in all these things that the priesthood consisted.

And as I said also, the positive proof that neither sacrifices, burnt offerings, the various purifications, nor anything at all of the Judaic way of life will ever return, is the fact that
the temple will never be reestablished. For just as it is true 1
that with the temple gone, everything is removed (if any part of their ritual seems to take place any more, it is a bold flouting of the law), so too, when it is proved that the temple will never resume its special form, it is proved at the same time that the rest of their system of worship will not return to its former condition either, and that no one will ever be either priest or king. For if, among their people, even a commoner was not allowed to serve
foreigners, how much more unlawful would it be for the king himself 10
to be subservient to others?

Prophecy Says that the Christian Priesthood Must Replace the Jewish

However, in view of my vehement zeal not only to silence the Jews but also to instruct your Love, let me use other evidence as well to prove my point and show that what pertains to the sacrifices and what pertains to their priesthood have been brought to a halt in such a way that they will never return to their former usage.

Who is it, now, who says this? That great and wonderful prophet, David. For explaining that one sacrifice was going to be discarded and another one instituted he says, "Many are the wonders which Thou, O Lord my God, hast wrought, and there is no thought that can be compared with Thy thoughts. I have declared and I have spoken."[1] Notice the prophet's wisdom; for when, struck with wonder at God's marvels, he says, "Many are the wonders which Thou, O Lord my God, hast wrought," he is not talking to us about the visible creation, heaven, earth, sea, water, and fire, nor about those astonishing miracles that were performed in Egypt, nor about any other wonder of this kind. Then what is he calling a marvel?[2]

"Sacrifice and offering Thou hast not desired."[3]

What? Is this the surprise? the wonder?

"No," he replies! For the truth is that this is not all that he saw; with his prophetic eye he also observed long ago the bringing in of the Gentiles,[4] and saw how those who were riveted to their gods, who worshipped stones and were in a more wretched condition than the brutes, suddenly came to have sight, recognized the Lord of all, left the polluted service of demons, and worshipped God in purity without the shedding of blood. Yet, observing that not only the Gentiles but also the less perfect among the Jews,[1] had left the worship that is conducted by means of sacrifices and burnt offerings and other items related to bodies, and had been led to our philosophy,--after taking into account the indescribable lovingkindness of God which transcends every thought, astounded at such a change in affairs and at how God had effected it, turning men from demons to angels and bringing in a way of life worthy of heaven itself (all of which took place when the old sacrifice was abolished and the other one introduced which is offered through the body of Christ), amazed, I say, and filled with wonder, David says, "Many are the wonders which Thou, O Lord my God, hast wrought."

---

[1] Ps. 40:5 (Ps. 39:6 LXX).

[2] Instead of this sentence, some MSS (incl. P804) have, "but about things that are more marvelous still. And having said this, he adds."

[3] Ps. 40:6 (Ps. 39:7 LXX).

[4] Cf. Ps. 40:3-4 Thomson, "Many will see and be struck with awe, and trust in the Lord. Happy the man, whose hope is the name of the Lord, and who hath not looked to vanities and lying fooleries."

And then, because he is foretelling all of this as the spokesman of Christ, after saying,[2] "Sacrifice and offering Thou hast not desired," he adds, "but a body hast Thou prepared for Me."[3] By this he means the body of the Lord, which became the common sacrifice for the world, and which cleansed our souls, destroyed sins,[4] quenched death, opened heaven, pointed us to many grand hopes, and supplied us with everything else, the knowledge of which led Paul to exclaim, "O the depth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are His judgments and how inscrutable His ways!"[1] It is when foreseeing all of this in advance that David says, "Many are the wonders which Thou, O Lord my God, hast wrought."

---

[1] Meaning, perhaps, those Jews who, unlike the prophets, did not understand the meaning of the sacrifices. Cf. below.

[2] Savile has, "listen; for after saying."

[3] Ps. 40:6 (Ps. 39:7 LXX). Rahlfs (with the Hebrew) gives "ears" instead of "body," but the Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and Alexandrinus codices of the LXX have "body," as does Heb. 10:5 Nestle.

[4] Some MSS (incl. V560 and P804) have, "sank sins."

Then speaking as Christ's spokesman, he continues, "Burnt offerings and sin offerings Thou hast not approved," and adds, "then I said, 'Behold I come.'"[2] "Then I said." When is "then"? It is when the more perfect instruction has come. It was necessary, you see, for the less perfect instruction to be learned from His servants, but the higher instruction that exceeded human nature had to be learned from the Lawgiver Himself. This is why Paul says, "In many and various ways God spoke of old to our fathers by the prophets; but in these last days He has spoken to us by a Son, whom He appointed the heir of all things, through whom also He created the world."[3] This is why John, too, says, "The law was given through Moses," but "grace and truth came through Jesus Christ."[4] It is the loftiest panegyric of the law that it prepared human nature for the Master.[5]

Then, to keep you from thinking that He was a new God, or that He was bringing in an innovation, listen to what He says: "At the

---

[1] Rom. 11:33 RSV, quoted also in Sermon i, p. 2, above.

[2] Ps. 40:6-7 (Ps. 39:7-8 LXX). The Greek reads "approved" instead of "required," as in the LXX. Some MSS (incl. P804) have, "sought."

[3] Heb. 1:1 RSV.

[4] John 1:17 RSV.

[5] Cf. the praise given to the law in Sermon ii, pp. 47-48, above.

head of a book[1] it is written concerning Me."[2] That is, the prophets foretold My Advent long ago; at the beginning of their Books they disclosed[3] to men some knowledge of My divinity. At 30
the beginning of creation, when God said, "Let Us make man in Sec. 3
Our image and likeness,"[4] He enigmatically revealed to us the divinity of the Son, with whom He was conversing.

Then, to show that the present polity is not opposed to the former one, but that it was God's will to terminate the one sacrifice and introduce another in its place (since it amounted to an intensification of moral restoration, not an opposition to it or a battle against it), after saying, "At the head of a book it is written concerning Me," He adds, "I was determined to do Thy will, O God, Thy law which was in My heart."[5] Then, to show what He 40
means by the will of God in this particular, He makes no mention of sacrifice, and burnt offerings, and other offerings, and toils, and labors, but says, "I have proclaimed the glad news of righteousness in a great congregation."[6] What can this mean, "I have proclaimed the glad news of righteousness"? (He does not say merely, "I have presented," but "I have proclaimed the glad news of.") What, then, can this mean? It means that it is not on the basis

---

[1] The RSV has, "in the roll of a book." Thomson has, "in the volume of a book." Chrysostom appears to take ἐν κεφαλίδι βιβλίου literally.

[2] Ps. 40:7 (Ps. 39:8 LXX).

[3] Six MSS read, "I disclosed."

[4] Gen. 1:26.

[5] Ps. 40:8 (Ps. 39:9 LXX).

[6] Ps. 40:9 (Ps. 39:10 LXX).

of good deeds, or toilsome labors, or of recompense, but on the
basis of grace alone, that God justifies our race. Paul expresses
the same point too when he says, "But now the righteousness of God 50
has been manifested apart from law."[1] God's righteousness is
through faith in Jesus[2] Christ, not through any toil or labor.

Then taking hold of this evidence Paul says, "For since the
law has but a shadow of the good things to come instead of the true
form of these realities, it can never, by the same sacrifices which
are continually offered year after year, make perfect those who draw
near. . . . Consequently, when Christ came into the world, He said,
'Sacrifices and offerings Thou hast not desired, but a body hast
Thou prepared for Me,'"[3] calling the Incarnation[4] the entrance of 1
the Only Begotten into the world, since it was through the Incarnation
that Christ came to be with us; not by exchanging one location
for another (for how could He, who is everywhere and fills everything?),
but by being manifested to us through flesh.

But because my battle is not with the Jews alone, but also
with the pagans and many of the heretics, allow me, and I shall
reveal a deeper meaning to you here, and search out the reason why
it is that Paul, when he has endless evidence to show that the law 10

---

[1] Rom. 3:21 RSV.

[2] This is the second use of the name "Jesus," outside of quotations and terminal doxologies, in these sermons. See Sermon vi, p. 184, above.

[3] Heb. 10:1, 5 RSV. Cf. p. 207, n. 2, above.

[4] Or, "the dispensation through the flesh." The Greek is τὴν διὰ σαρκὸς οἰκονομίαν. Cf. Sermon v, p. 119, n. 2, above.

and the old way of life had been abrogated, chooses to select *this* evidence. For he doesn't do it lightly or by chance, but with a certain reason and wisdom beyond words. Everyone will agree that if he had wished to use them, he had other longer and more emphatic proofs than this with which to support his position.

Isaiah, for example, says, My will is not among you.[1] "I have had enough of burnt offerings of rams, and I have no pleasure in the fat of lambs, nor in the blood of bulls and goats, nor in your coming to appear before Me, for who has required these things of you? . . . If you bring Me the finest grade of wheat flour, it will be in vain; incense is an abomination to Me."[2] Again, in another place, "I have not called you now, O Jacob, or made you weary, O Israel. You have not praised Me . . . with sacrifices, nor served Me with your gifts. I have not burdened you with frankincense, nor have you bought incense for Me with money."[3]

Jeremiah says, "To what purpose do you bring incense to Me from Sheba, and cinnamon from a distant land? Your burnt offerings . . . are not pleasant to Me."[4] And again, "Collect your burnt offerings with your sacrifices[1] and eat meat."[2] And another prophet says, "Take away from Me the noise of your songs; to the melody of your musical instruments I will not listen."[3]

---

[1] Four MSS (incl. P804) and Savile have, "Isaiah, for example, showing that their sacrifices were hated, says as God's spokesman, 'What to Me is the multitude of your sacrifices?'" Isa. 1:11. The words, "My will is not among you," may be taken as an interpretation of Isa. 1:10 RSV, "Hear the word of the Lord, you rulers of Sodom! Give ear to the teaching of our God, you people of Gomorrah!"

[2] Isa. 1:11-13. Portions of this passage are quoted also in Sermon i, p. 29, and in Sermon iv, p. 99, above.

[3] Isa. 43:22-23. For verse 22 the RSV has, "You did not call me, O Jacob; but you have become weary of me, O Israel!"

[4] Jer. 6:20.

Also in another place, when the Jews say, "Will the Lord
accept" me because of burnt offerings? "Shall I give my first-born
for my ungodliness, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?",
the prophet rebukes them and says, "He has shown you, O man, what is
good. What does the Lord God require of you but to love mercy, to 40
do justice" and righteousness, "and to be ready to follow the Lord
your God?"[4] And David talks the same way too: "I cannot accept
calves from your houses, or he-goats out of your folds."[5]

When Paul has so many proofs available by which God makes plain His rejection of those sacrifices, and of the new moons, the sabbaths, and the festivals, that He has removed every one of them, why is it that he mentions this one item alone--and not lightly either, or by chance?

I will give you the reason at once. Many unbelievers, and
many of the Jews themselves, when fighting against us say that the 50
ancient way of life was not destroyed because it was imperfect, or
on account of the introduction of our better way of life, but on

---

[1] Some MSS (incl. P804) read, "I have hated . . . your sacrifices."

[2] Jer. 7:20. Jer. 7 is quoted also in Sermon i, pp. 10, 31, above; and in Sermon viii, p. 254, below.

[3] Amos 5:23.

[4] Micah 6:7-8.

[5] Ps. 50:9 (Ps. 49:9 LXX).

account of the wickedness of those who, at that time, were offering the sacrifices.

Isaiah indeed does say, "If you stretch forth your hands, I will turn My eyes away from you; and if you multiply your prayer, I will not listen to you," and he adds, giving the reason, "For your hands are full of blood,"[1] which is not an accusation against the sacrifices but an indictment against the wickedness of those who offer them, showing that God truly did not accept the sacrifices because the Jews offered them with defiled hands. Again, when David says, "I cannot accept calves from your house, or he-goats out of your folds," he adds, "but to the sinner God says, 'Why do you recite My decrees in detail, and take My covenant on your lips? You have hated instruction and have thrown My words behind your back. When you have seen a thief, you have become a companion of his, and you have taken part with adulterers. Your mouth has abounded in unrighteousness, and your tongue has woven deceptions. Sitting down you have talked against your brother, and slandered your mother's son."[2]

This makes it clear that God did not deprecate the sacrifices on their intrinsic merits, but on the basis that the people who offered them committed adultery, stole, and plotted against their brothers. So each one of the prophets, they say, is condemning those who offered the sacrifices, when he says that God deprecates the sacrifices.

---

[1] Isa. 1:15.

[2] Ps. 50:16-20 (Ps. 49:16-20 LXX). Cf. p. 211, above.

Sec. 4

Those who take the opposite position say to me, But Paul gave them all the blow that was needed, and rebuked their impudence sufficiently, with this particular piece of evidence. In his desire to show that God has rejected and nullified that way of life for its own sake, by reason of its being imperfect, Paul uses a testimony in which no accusation is brought against those who offer the sacrifices, and in which the imperfection of this way of life is clearly shown apart from any other considerations. For David,[1] without any condemnation of the Jews, says plainly, "Sacrifice and offering Thou hast not desired; a body hast Thou prepared for Me. Burnt offerings and sin offerings Thou hast not accepted."[2] It is in interpretation of this statement[3] that Paul says, "He abolishes the first in order to establish the second."[4] If, after saying, "Sacrifice and offering Thou hast not desired," Paul said no more, the argument[5] would have some room to stand; but since he goes on to say,[6] "A body hast Thou prepared for Me," indicating the introduction of a different sacrifice, he gives no hope that the former one will ever be restored.

Paul is expounding this very thing when he says, "Through this offering we have been sanctified by the will of Christ."[1] "For if the sprinkling of defiled persons with the blood of bulls and goats, and with the ashes of a heifer, sanctifies for the purification of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the Holy Spirit offered Himself without blemish . . . , purify our conscience from dead works?"[2]

---

[1] Lit., "the prophet."

[2] Ps. 40:6 (Ps. 39:7 LXX). For the Greek, see p. 207, n. 2, above.

[3] In Heb. 10:6.

[4] Heb. 10:9 RSV.

[5] That the old sacrifices were abrogated (temporarily) because of the sins of those who offered them. See p. 211, above.

[6] Montfaucon (with P804) is very different, and reads, "Then after saying, 'Sacrifice . . . ,' he adds, 'A body . . . .'"

That the former things[3] have come to an end, never to rise again for ever, and different things have been brought in in their place, is proved sufficiently by this passage.

The Superiority of Priest-King Melchizedek

Now let us proceed further. What I was anxious to show you before,[4] namely, that the Levitical priesthood, too, has disappeared and will never return to view, I will make plain, expressly and clearly, from the Scriptures themselves, after prefacing a few remarks to make the explanation of my statement clearer to you.

Abraham, after returning from Persia,[5] became the father of Isaac and, later on, he of Jacob, and Jacob of the twelve patriarchs, from whom came the twelve tribes, or rather, the thirteen--for Joseph's children, Ephraim and Manasseh, became leaders of tribes in his place. (And just as a tribe was named after each of the sons of Jacob, one each after Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Naphtali, Gad, Asher, and Benjamin, so too in the case of Joseph there came to be two tribes named after his sons, Manasseh and Ephraim. And the tribes were called, the one, of Ephraim, the other, of Manasseh.)[1]

---

[1] Heb. 10:10, quoted freely. Cf. the RSV, "And by that will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." It is noteworthy that the quotation above omits the name, "Jesus."

[2] Heb. 9:13-14. In place of "the Holy Spirit," Nestle and the RSV have, "the eternal Spirit."

[3] Greek, ἐκεῖνα. Montfaucon (with P804) has, ἐκείνη, permitting the translation, "the former sacrifice."

[4] See p. 205, above.

[5] Cf. p. 216, n. 4, below. Abraham chased the "Persian" kings as far as Damascus before returning, by way of Salem, to his camp near Hebron. Gen. 14.

Now of these thirteen tribes, while all the others owned fields and had many sources of income, and all of them farmed and practiced every other livelihood, the tribe of Levi alone, honored with the priesthood, was free from pursuing an ordinary career and did not work, or follow trades, or engage in any common business, but attended only to the priesthood, and received tithes from all the people of wine, wheat, barley, and everything else. Everyone paid them tithes, and this was their income.[2]

Further, there was never to be a priest from any other tribe than this one;[3] for it was to this tribe, the tribe of Levi, that Aaron belonged; his descendents received the priesthood by succession, and no one ever became a priest who belonged to a different tribe. These Levites, then, received tithes from the others and were thus sustained.

However, even before the days of Jacob and Isaac, at a time when Moses had not yet been born, nor the law written, nor the Levitical priesthood brought on the scene, when neither tabernacle nor temple had yet been raised, nor the tribes differentiated, nor Jerusalem become known,[1]--in short, when nothing that relates to Judaism had as yet received its beginning,--a certain Melchizedek was priest of the Most High God.[2]

---

[1] Cf. Num. 1.

[2] Cf. Lev. 27:30; Num. 18:26-32.

[3] Num. 3:5-10.

This Melchizedek was at one and the same time both a king and a priest, for he was a type of Christ[3] and is mentioned clearly in Scripture. After Abraham had attacked and beaten the Persians,[4] and had rescued his nephew Lot from their control, and had carried off all the spoils, when he was returning victorious from a pitched battle--Scripture says[5] concerning Melchizedek: "And Melchizedek, the king of Salem, brought out bread and wine. He was a priest of the Most High God, and he blessed Abraham and said, "'Blessed be Abraham by the Most High God, who created heaven and earth, and blessed be the Most High God, who has delivered your enemies into your power.' And Abraham gave him a tithe of everything."

---

[1] The city of Salem, of which Melchizedek was king, is today usually identified with Jerusalem, whose existence is attested archeologically as far back as the twelfth Egyptian dynasty (the nineteenth and eighteenth centuries BC), which is the approximate period of Abraham's sojourn in Palestine. S. Horn, "Abraham," "Jerusalem," SDABD, VIII, 8-11, 554-64.

[2] Gen. 14:18-24.

[3] Lit., "he was going to be a type."

[4] That is, Chedorlaomer, king of Elam, Tidal, king of Goim, Amraphel, king of Shinar, and Arioch, king of Ellasar. Gen. 14:1-17. The identification of these persons and places presents difficulties, but suggests origins within territory controlled by the Persian Empire in Chrysostom's day. Josephus (Antiquities i. 9-10), incidentally, calls the kings, "Assyrians." Cf. also Sermon vi, p. 179, above.

[5] The words, "in a certain way," are inserted at this point by Migne but are missing from V560 and P804.

If, then, one of the prophets[1] is seen to say that after Aaron and his priesthood and the sacrifices and offerings that 50 go with it, a different priest will arise, who will not belong to the tribe of Levi but to a different one from which there had never been a priest before, and not according to the order of Aaron but "after the order of Melchizedek,"[2] it is clear that the old priesthood has been brought to an end and that a new and different one has been established in its place. For if the old one had been destined to continue, it would have been necessary to say, not "after the order of Melchizedek," but "after the order of Aaron."

Who, then, is it who says this? The same prophet who spoke about the sacrifices. When speaking about Christ somewhere else, he says also, "The Lord said to My Lord, sit at My right hand."[3] So that no one would suppose that this was said about some ordi- Sec. 5
nary man,[4] Isaiah doesn't say it, or Jeremiah, or any other pro- 2
phet who is himself a commoner, but the King Himself says it.

No king,[5] of course, can call anyone but God his "Lord." If the one who says this had been a commoner, some shameless sophist might perhaps have said that he was talking about a man.

---

[1] That is, David.

[2] Ps. 110:3-4 (Ps. 109:3-4 LXX).

[3] Ps. 110:1 (Ps. 109:1 LXX). Cf. Matt. 22:45 RSV, "If David thus calls him Lord, how is he his son?"

[4] Lit., "a certain one of many men."

[5] The clause, "This is so you may see that," precedes this sentence in the Greek, but is bracketed in the Migne edition.

But since He is a King, He is not calling a man his "Lord." And if David were speaking about an ordinary man, how could he say that he sat down at the right hand of the ineffably great glory? This would be insupportable. Nonetheless, concerning this Person he says, "The Lord said to My Lord, sit at My right hand, till I make Thine enemies Thy footstool."[1]

Then, so you would not suppose Him to be weak and powerless, He adds, "The rulership shall be with Thee in the day of Thy power." Then, expressing the matter more clearly, He says, "Before the morning star, I begot Thee from the womb." (No human being was born before the morning star!) "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek."[2] (He does not say, "after the order of Aaron.") So ask the Jew, "If the old priesthood was not destined to be destroyed, why does He introduce a different priest after the order of Melchizedek?"

Now see how Paul clarifies this very passage when he comes to it. For having said about Christ, "As he says also in another place, 'Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek,'" he adds, "About this we have much to say which is hard to explain."[3] Then, after rebuking his readers,[4] he tells (for it is necessary to abbreviate) who Melchizedek was and gives his history, saying that "he met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings and blessed him; and to him Abraham apportioned a tithe of everything."[1]

---

[1] Ps. 110:1 (Ps. 109:1 LXX). Cf. Heb. 10:12-13.

[2] Ps. 110:3-4 (Ps. 109:3-4 LXX). Cf. the RSV, "Your people will offer themselves freely on the day you lead your host upon the holy mountains. From the womb of the morning like dew your youth will come to you. . . . 'You are a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.'"

[3] Heb. 5:6, 11 RSV.

[4] Lit., "the disciples."

Then, unveiling the mystery[2] of the type, he exclaims, "See how great He is! Abraham the patriarch apportioned him a tithe of everything."[3] He does not state this merely; he desires to prove that our priesthood is very much greater than that of the Jews. And in these very types the anticipated preeminence of the realities is shown plainly; for Abraham was the father of Isaac, the grandfather of Jacob, and (since Levi was a son of Jacob), the forefather of Levi, from whom the Jewish priesthood took its origin. But in the days of Melchizedek, who was a type of our priesthood, this Abraham, who was the forefather of the Levites and of the Judaic priests,[4] held the rank of a layman! He made this evident in two ways, both by paying Melchizedek a tithe (it is the laity who pay tithe to the priests), and in that he was blessed by him (for laymen are blessed by the priests).

So notice again how great the preeminence of our priesthood is, when Abraham, the patriarch of the Jews and the forefather of the Levites, is found being blessed by Melchizedek and paying him tithes! The Old Testament mentions both of these points, both that Melchizedek blessed Abraham and that he received tithes from him. Then after setting each of these Old Testament points before us, Paul says, "See how great he is!" (How great who is? "Melchizedek," he says,) "to whom Abraham their patriarch gave a tithe of the spoils. And those descendents of Levi who receive the priesthood have a commandment . . . to take tithes from the people, that is, from their brethren, even though these also are descended from Abraham.[1]

---

[1] Heb. 7:1-2, quoted freely. Cf. Gen. 14:17-20, and pp. 215-16, above.

[2] Greek, θεώρημα, "doctrine," especially of the higher mysteries of the faith which belong to the sphere of σοφία; "mystic vision; object of contemplation." Lampe.

[3] Heb. 7:4, quoted freely.

[4] Montfaucon (with P804) omits the "and," leaving, "the forefather of the Levites (the Judaic priests)." V560 reads, "the forefather of Levi and the Judaic priests." On p. 220, below, Chrysostom speaks of "the Levites, the Jewish priests," as though he thinks all the Levites were priests. Actually, however, only those Levites who were direct descendents of Aaron were priests; the others were assigned sacred responsibilities by Moses, but were not allowed to enter the priesthood. See, for example, Num. 3:5-13.

What he means is, that the Levites, the Jewish priests, received a commandment in the law[2] to take tithes from the other Jews. That is, in spite of the fact that they were all descended from Abraham, both the Levites and the rest of the people, the Levites nonetheless take tithes from their brothers. But Melchizedek, whose genealogy is not to be traced from the Levites (since he was not a descendent of Abraham's, nor a member of the tribe of the Levites, but belonged to a different race instead), "tithed" Abraham (that is, took tithes from him).

And this is not all; there is something else as well.

What is this?

---

[1] Heb. 7:4-5.

[2] Curiously, the phrase, "in the law," is omitted in the ellipsis noted in verse 5, above. For the commandment involved here, see p. 215, n. 2, above.

Melchizedek even blessed Abraham, the man who held the promises.

And what does Paul say this proves?

That Abraham was very much inferior.

How so?

"It is beyond dispute," he says, "that the inferior is blessed by the superior."[1] It follows that if Abraham, the forefather of the Levites, had not been inferior to Melchizedek, Melchizedek would not have blessed him, and neither would Abraham have given him tithes.

Then, desiring to show another point which may be advanced with reference to Melchizedek,[2] he adds, "One might even say," (that is, "after a manner of speaking,") "that Levi himself, who receives tithes, paid tithes through Abraham."[3] What does this mean, "paid tithes"? It means that through his ancestor he who was not yet born paid tithes to Melchizedek; "for he was still in the loins of his ancestor when Melchizedek met him,"[4] which is why, before he makes this statement Paul says, "one might even say."

His reason for saying all of this he adds next: "Now if perfection had been attainable through the Levitical priesthood (for under it the people received the law), what further need would there have been for another priest to arise after the order of Melchizedek, rather than one named after the order of Aaron?"[1] What does this mean? If the Jewish institutions had been perfect, and the law had not been a shadow of good things yet to come; if it had accomplished everything by itself and had not been destined to yield to a different law, the former priesthood to be abandoned and a different one introduced in its place--why did the prophet say, "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek," since it would have been necessary to say, "After the order of Aaron"?

---

[1] Heb. 7:7 RSV.

[2] Lit., "that that other thing could have proceeded through Melchizedek." The Greek is ὅτι διὰ τοῦ Μελχιζεδὲκ προῆλθεν ἂν ἐκεῖνο. Some MSS have, ἐκείνῳ. V560 has, προσῆλθεν ἐκείνῳ. P804 has, προσῆλθον ἐκείνῳ.

[3] Heb. 7:9 RSV.

[4] Heb. 7:10 RSV.

This, then, is why he asks, "If perfection had been attainable through the Levitical priesthood, . . . what further need would there have been for another priest to arise after the order of Melchizedek?" rather than one named "after the order of Aaron?"

It is clear from this that the former priesthood had come to its end and a different one, very much better and more sublime, had been introduced in its place.

When this is recognized, it is seen as well that corresponding with the priesthood a different polity--manifestly, this one of ours--and a better system of law, had to be introduced along with it. It is to prove this very thing that Paul says, "For when there is a change in the priesthood, there is necessarily a change in the law as well,"[2] and One is the Author of them both.[3] Since most of the laws were concerned with the rites[4] of the priesthood, when the former priesthood was discarded and another introduced, a greater system of laws had to be brought in as well. Then to show who it is about whom this is said, he says, "For the One about whom these things are spoken belonged to another tribe, from which no one has ever served at the altar. For it is evident that our Lord was descended from Judah, and in connection with that tribe, Moses said nothing about a priesthood."[1]

---

[1] Heb. 7:11 RSV.

[2] Heb. 7:12 RSV.

[3] Migne prints this sentence in italics as though it were part of the quotation, but it does not occur in Scripture. It is omitted by V560 and P804.

[4] Greek, ἀκολουθία. Lampe.

When, then, it is seen that Christ comes from a different tribe, namely, that of Judah, and that He is a priest after the order of Melchizedek, who was much more honorable than Abraham, it is acknowledged on all sides that a priesthood much more exalted than the earlier one has been introduced in its place. For if it is true that the _type_ was more illustrious than the Judaic priesthood, how much more the reality!

To prove it, Paul ways, "This becomes even more evident when another priest arises in the likeness of Melchizedek, who has become a priest, not according to a legal requirement concerning the flesh but by the power of an indestructible life."[2] What is the meaning of, "Not according to a legal requirement concerning the flesh but according to the power of an indestructible life"? It means that none of His commands dealt with "flesh." He did not enjoin us to offer sheep and calves, but to serve God through the excellence that pertains to the soul; and He set up as the reward of this an indestructible life. Further, when He came He resurrected us who had been slain by our sins and restored us to life,[1] putting an end to a double death, that of sin and of the body. Hence it is because He came to bring us blessings of this sort that he says, "not according to a legal requirement concerning the flesh but by the power of an indestructible life."

---

[1] Heb. 7:13-14.

[2] Heb. 7:15-16. Instead of, "concerning the flesh," the RSV, from the same Greek text, gives, "concerning bodily descent," and the NEB, "a system of earth-bound rules." Cf. Chrysostom's interpretation in his Sermon xiii _On Hebrews_, "It is appropriate that he calls this commandment a 'fleshly' one, since everything it specified pertained to the flesh. For it said, 'Circumcize the flesh,' 'Anoint the flesh,' 'Wash the flesh,' 'Purify the flesh,' . . . And if you would like to learn its promises, listen, 'long life for the flesh,' 'milk and honey for the flesh,' . . ."

The Conclusion and Appeal for Action

This further point, then, has now been proved, namely, Sec. 6
that since the priesthood has been changed, it was reasonable that a change in the law should have been required as well. However, it would have been possible to demonstrate this very point expressly and to parade the prophets one after another giving their evidence to this effect, both that the law was to be changed and the way of life reformed for the better, and that no Jewish king will ever rise up again.

But because one ought to speak only of so many things as the hearer can receive (not everything at the same time or all at once), I shall keep these matters for another occasion, and for the time being end my sermon here with the exhortation to your Love that you remember what I have said and associate it with what I have said before. And what I have previously begged of you I beg again that you rescue your brothers and devote much attention to our neglected members. I welcome labor like this not just to be talking or for the joy of applause and acclaim, but in order to lead back into the way of truth those who have broken away.

---

[1] Montfaucon (with V560 and P804) omit, "and restored us to life."

Let no one say to me, "I have nothing in common with him; 50 allow me to succeed in my own affairs." No one is able to accomplish his own affairs successfully without love for his neighbor, or apart from his neighbor's well-being. This is why Paul says, "Let no one seek his own good, but each one the good of his neighbor,"[1] knowing that your affairs rest on what is profitable to your neighbor. You are well and your brother is sick? If you look at things rightly, you will grieve deeply over him, and will imitate even in this respect that blessed man who said, "Who is sick, and I am not sick? Who is made to fall, and I am not indignant?"[2]

When we donate a couple of obols, or spend a little money on 1 the poor, it gives us a good feeling. Then how much pleasure will be ours if we succeed in saving souls? How great a reward shall we enjoy in the world to come? Why, even here, as often as we meet[3] we shall derive great happiness from the encounter, remembering the virtuous acts we have performed for them; and when we behold them, standing at the fearsome tribunal, we shall enjoy great confidence.[4]

---

[1] I Cor. 10:24.

[2] II Cor. 11:29, quoted also in Sermon iv, p. 106, above. Cf. the RSV, based on the same Greek text, "Who is weak, and I am not weak? . . ."

[3] That is, we and the persons we have saved.

[4] Cf. I John 4:17 NEB, ". . . confidence on the day of judgment."

Just as those who do wrong and cheat and rob and inflict endless woes on those around them, when they go away to the other world and see their victims (for the Bible says they will assuredly see them; it is clear from the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus[1]), will be unable to speak a word or say a thing in their own defense, but, filled with deep shame and condemnation, will be led out of their victims' sight, away to the rivers of fire,[2] so those who save souls,[3] both teachers and catechizers, on seeing those whom they have saved pleading for them in the world to come, will be filled with great confidence.

Paul teaches this clearly when he says, "You can be proud of us as we can be of you." When, pray? "On the day of our Lord Jesus Christ.[4] And Christ, in His turn, gives us this advice, "Make friends for yourselves by means of unrighteous mammon, so that when you fail, they may receive you into their eternal habitations."[5]

Do you see that much confidence will accrue to you at that time from the persons you benefit today? And if, when an act of almsgiving[6] takes place, there are so many crowns, so large a reward, so great a recompense, when there is succor to a soul, how very great and numerous will our blessings be!

---

[1] Luke 16:19-21. Verse 23 RSV says, "And in Hades, being in torment, he lifted up his eyes, and saw Abraham far off and Lazarus in his bosom." See Sermon viii, p. 252, below.

[2] For a river of fire, cf. Sermon i, p. 15, above.

[3] Reading οἱ σώζοντες with P804, instead of οἱ ζῶντες, as in Migne.

[4] II Cor. 1:14.

[5] Luke 16:9. The RSV, following a different text, reads, ". . . so that when it fails, they may receive you into the eternal habitations."

[6] Lit., "an expenditure of means."

If the well-known Tabitha,[1] after clothing widows and alleviating poverty, came back again from death to life, and if, long before the general resurrection, the tears of those she had helped brought back into a body a soul that had departed, what will the tears of those you save achieve? Just as the widows who gathered around her made a woman who had been dead alive again, so when the ones you save today gather around you at that time, they will cause you to enjoy much lovingkindness[2] and will snatch you from the fire of Gehenna.

In view of all this, then, let us be stirred and aroused not merely with such zeal as we have at the present moment, but stir up the fire you now have and as you leave here apportion the salvation of the city among yourselves;[3] and if you don't know anyone who suffers with this disease, search them out diligently. In this way I will become the more eager in my addresses to you--having learned from your actual deeds that I have not been "sowing on a stone"[4]--

---

[1] Lit., "that woman, Tabitha." Her story, in which she is also called Dorcas, is found in Acts 9:36-41. Verses 39-40 RSV say, "All the widows stood beside him weeping, and showing coats and garments which Dorcas made while she was with them. But Peter put them all outside and knelt down and prayed; then turning to the body he said, 'Tabitha, rise.' And she opened her eyes."

[2] That is, through their intercessions with God. See p. 226, above.

[3] Greek, διανείμασθε τὴν σωτηρίαν τῆς πόλεως.

[4] A proverb, εἰς πέτραν σπείρομεν. Cf. πέτρας σπείρειν in E. L. von Leutsch and F. G. Schneidewing, Corpus Paroemiographorum

and you yourselves will be the more eager about this splendid
activity. For just as in business, a man who had made a profit of 50
two aurei becomes the more enthusiastic to collect and accumulate
ten and twenty of them, so in respect to doing good; the man who has
successfully performed a good work, from that very success derives
a certain encouragement and inspiration to undertake others as well.

So in order for us to save our brothers, and store up for
ourselves ahead of time mercy in respect to our sins, or rather,
much confidence, and above all this, to provide for the glory of
God's name, let us go out on this chase, this hunting expedition,
with our wives, children, and servants, and let us pull out of the
devil's trap those whom he has taken alive to serve his will, and 1
let us not quit before we have completely done our part, whether
they are persuaded or not persuaded. Or rather, it is impossible
for those who are Christians not to be persuaded. But just the
same, so you may not have this excuse, I say that if you see some-
one who is still unconvinced after you have talked and talked to
him and done everything that you ought to have done, bring him to
the priests,[1] and surely by the grace of God they will be more than
a match for such prey--and the whole credit will go to you, who led
him there.

Let the men talk these matters over with their wives, and the 10

Graecorum (Three vols.; Göttingen, 1839-51), Vol. II, which gives examples, as does Liddell and Scott. Cf. also Matt. 13:5 RSV, "Other seeds fell on rocky ground, where they had not much soil."

[1] In Sermon i, p. 17, above, he invites them to bring such persons to himself.

women with their husbands, and fathers with their children, and friends with their friends. Let the Jews learn, and those who are reputed to be linked with us but who cherish Jewish rituals, that there is a certain zeal among us, a thoughtful care and sleeplessness,[1] for those of our brothers who have deserted to them. 1

Assuredly, even before we do it, the Jews will drive away those from among us who resort there. But rather, no one will dare any more to run over to them. Instead, the body of the church will be pure. May God, "who desires all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth,"[2] give you power for this hunt, and lead them away from this error, and after saving all of you together, deem you worthy of the kingdom of heaven, unto His glory, since to Him pertain glory and power for ever and ever, Amen.

---

[1] Or, "watchfulness."

[2] I Tim. 2:4 RSV.

SERMON VIII

CASUALTIES, CHARMS, AND CHAMPIONS[1]

The Drunken "Fast" Is Over

The Jewish fast is over!

Or rather, the Jews' drunken orgy.

A person can be drunk without wine! It is quite possible for a man who never touches a drop to act intoxicated and revel in dissipation.

If it were not possible to be drunk without wine, the prophet
would not have said, "Woe to those who are drunk but not from wine."[2] 20
If it were not possible to be drunk without wine, Paul would not have said, "Do not be drunk *with wine*."[3] But he said, "Do not be drunk with wine," because it is possible to be drunk with something else. It is possible, indeed it is, to be drunk with anger, and with unseemly desire, with love for money, with ambition for applause, and with many other passions. For drunkenness is nothing else than a state of distraction from right reason. It is a derangement and loss of sound mental health.

In consequence, it is not only the man who gives himself up to large quantities of undiluted wine, but also the one who cherishes quite a different passion in his soul, who most definitely may be said to be drunk. The man who loves a woman who is not his wife and devotes himself to prostitutes, is drunk; for just as the man who drinks freely of undiluted wine, after getting tipsy talks loudly and coarsely and sees one thing for another, so this other man, filled with his licentious passion like wine, says never a sound word but disgraceful, corrupt, rude, and ludicrous things only, and sees one thing for another, since he is blind to the sights about him and imagines that he sees everywhere the woman he longs to outrage. In meetings and banquets, on every occasion and in every place, like someone out of his head, who has lost his wits, he appears to hear nothing though any number of remarks are made to him by any number of people, and remains intent on the woman, and dreams his sin. And he is suspicious, afraid of everything, no different from a "net-shy"[1] animal.

---

[1] The heading in Migne is, "Against the Jews; Sermon Eight."

[2] Apparently from Isa. 28:1 LXX, quoted freely. Cf. also Isa. 29:9 and 51:21.

[3] Eph. 5:18 RSV.

In turn, that man too who is controlled by anger is drunk. His appearance becomes swollen, his voice harsh, and his eyes bloodshot. His mind is darkened and his understanding submerged. His tongue stutters,[2] his eyes dart, and his ears hear one thing for another, as his anger strikes his brain a blow more severe than any unmixed wine, and works up a storm, and creates a relentless tempest.

If the person who is controlled by lust or anger is drunk, even more so is that man drunk and raving who is irreligious, who blasphemes God and stands in opposition to His laws, and who is never willing to give up his misguided contention. Indeed, he is actually worse off than carousers and those who are out of their heads--even if he himself does not appear to know it. Beyond question for a person not to realize the things he is doing that are out of place is an ordinary part of being drunk.[1] It is just like insanity. The worst thing about being insane is that those who are that way don't even recognize the fact that they are. This is precisely the condition of the Jews today; they are drunk and they do not know it.

---

[1] Cf. the English "gun-shy."

[2] Lit., "his tongue trembles." One MS has, "his tongue is frustrated."

We Must Look After Our Casualties

So, then, their "fast" is now over, the one more debased than any drunken orgy. Let us not, however, allow our concern for our brethren to lapse, or suppose their care to be in any way inappropriate. After soldiers have fought an engagement[2] and driven the enemy away, when they return from chasing him they don't go at once to their tents; they go first to the battlefield and take up their comrades who have fallen. The dead they bury, but any they see lying among the dead, wounded but still breathing, they pick up and carry to their tents with every solicitude. They withdraw the arrow, summon the doctors, wash off the blood, apply medicines, and using every possible attention, restore them again to health.

---

[1] Or, "is a condition that deserves the name of drunkenness."

[2] Five MSS (incl. P804) read, "Let us do what soldiers do after they have fought an engagement."

We should do the same. Through the grace of God we have 40
driven the Jews away by arming the prophets against them. Now,
as we come back from every quarter, let us look[1] and see if any
of our brothers have fallen, if any have been swept away by the
fast, if any have partaken with the Jews in their festival. But
let us not bury any of them! Let us pick them up, all of them,
and heal them. In ordinary wars it is not possible for a soldier
to revive and resurrect a man once he has fallen and his soul has
departed, but in this war,[2] even if the wound a man has received 50
is mortal, it is still possible, if we so desire, the grace of God
cooperating, to lead him back to life again. This is not a death
of nature like the other, but of attitude and disposition. It is
possible to resurrect a dead attitude and to persuade a dead soul
to resume its proper life and acknowledge its Lord. 1

Sec. 2 Don't say, "What's the use?"--Let us not get weary, brothers. Let us not grow faint. Let us not lose heart.[3] Let no one pass that remark to me, "We had to be on guard and do everything before the fast, but now, when the fast is over, and the sin has been committed, and lawlessness has been fulfilled--what's the use?"[1] If a person knows what the care of one's brothers really is, he knows that it is supremely necessary to apply himself now, and to strain every nerve. It is certainly necessary to take precautions before a sin is committed, and we must also extend a hand after a man has fallen. If God since the beginning had followed the practice of taking precautions before a sin was committed but of afterwards giving up and abandoning a man to lie where he had fallen for ever, not one of us either would have been saved. He does not do this, however, but being tenderhearted and gentle, and because He longs for our salvation above all things else, He demonstrates great concern for us even after we sin.

---

[1] A change in the punctuation of the Greek allows the translation, "by arming the prophets from every quarter against them. Now, as we come back, let us look."

[2] Lit., "in this war and battle."

[3] Cf. Gal. 6:9 RSV, "And let us not grow weary in well-doing, for in due season we shall reap, if we do not lose heart," and Heb. 12:3 RSV, ". . . so that you may not grow weary or fainthearted."

For example, He warned Adam prior to his sin and said, "You may eat of every tree in the garden; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat of it, you shall die."[2] In the lightness of the command, in the generous number of the things it allows, as also in the severity of the threatened punishment and in the swiftness with which it would be inflicted (for it does not say after one, or two, or three days, but on the very day on which you eat of it, you shall die), notice that the man was alerted in every way that he needed.

Nevertheless, when--after so much providential care and instruction, advice and kindness--Adam disobeyed his orders and fell, God did not say, "Why should I do any more? What's the use?

---

[1] Cf. Sermon i, p. 4, above, where he says that medicine applied after the event would do no good.

[2] Gen. 2:16-17.

He has eaten, he has fallen, he has broken the law, he has trusted the devil, he has dishonored My commandment, he has received his punishment, he has died, he has been delivered over to death, he has passed under the sentence; why then should I talk to him any more?" God said none of this, but both went to him at once and reasoned with him, consoling him and applying a different medicine, that of toil and sweat; and He did not cease doing and undertaking everything until He had set on its feet the nature that had fallen, and freed it from death, and led it by hand to heaven, and given it greater blessings than it had lost. By these very acts God taught the devil that his plot had brought him no profit, and that though he had caused men to leave Paradise, he would see them a little later in heaven, mingling with the angels!

God did the same for Cain. He took precautions with him too before he sinned, stating explicitly ahead of time, "You have sinned; but be composed. He will look to you and you will rule over him."[2] Observe the wisdom and sagacity of God in this. You are afraid, He says, that because of the honor he received from Me,[3] he will deprive you of the prerogatives of the first-born and preempt the leadership which belongs to you. (First-born sons needed to be more honorable

---

[1] Lit., "had expelled men from."

[2] Gen. 4:7. In Scripture, God makes this statement after Cain offered his unacceptable sacrifice but before he committed his capital sin of killing Abel. Cf. the RSV, "If you do not do well, sin is couching at the door; its desire is for you, but you must master it."

[3] Cf. Gen. 4:4-5 RSV, "And the Lord had regard for Abel and his offering, but for Cain and his offering he had no regard."

than those born second.) Cheer up, He says. Don't worry or be afraid about it. "He will look to you and you will rule over him." In other words, continue in the dignity of the first-born and become a refuge, a shelter and guardian, to your brother. Rule him and dominate him--but this alone: Do not rush out and murder him. Do not proceed to such sinful slaughter.

In spite of this, Cain disobeyed. He failed to rest content, but committed his foul murder, and plunged his right hand into his brother's throat. What now? Did God say, "Let us leave him alone from henceforth. What's the use any more? He has committed murder, killed his brother, despised My counsel, and dared a monstrous and unpardonable slaughter, after enjoying the benefit of such great, such good advice, instruction, and counsel; he has rejected it all from his mind and paid no attention to it. Let him therefore be left alone; let him be discarded; let him be reckoned unworthy of so much as a word from Me"?

God neither said nor did anything of the sort! No; He goes to him again, and corrects him, and asks, "Where is your brother Abel?" And He does not drop him even when he denies his crime, but urges him, unwilling as he is, into a confession of what he has done. And when he answers, "I do not know," God replies, "The voice of your brother's blood is crying out to Me."[1] The deed itself, He says, proclaims the murderer.

What does Cain say in reply? "My fault is too great to be forgiven. And if Thou dost expel me from the land, I shall also be hidden from Thy face."[1] That is, "The sin is beyond mercy, defense, or forgiveness, but if Thou desirest to avenge the deed, deprived of Thy support I shall lie exposed to all." What does God say now? "Not so! He who kills Cain shall suffer seven-fold vengeance!"[2] That is, "Don't worry about this. You will live a long life; and if anyone kills you, he will become liable for many punishments." (The number "seven" in Scripture signifies an indefinite large number.)

---

[1] Gen. 4:9-10.

Since Cain was subjected to many punishments, anxiety, trembling, groanings, discouragement, and physical weakness,[3] God means that the man who kills you and thus frees you from these punishments, will bring the punishment on himself. While such a statement seems oppressive and severe, it is in reality an intimation[4] of great solicitude; for it was through a desire to bring those who came later to their senses that God contrived a type of punishment which had the power to rid Cain of his sin. Had God immediately killed him, Cain would have passed away with his sin concealed, and would never have been recognized as a murderer[5] by those who came later.

---

[1] Gen. 4:13-14. Cf. the RSV, "My punishment is greater than I can bear. Behold, thou hast driven me this day away from the ground; and from thy face I shall be hidden." Thomson, on the basis of the same text as Migne's, gives, "Is my fault too great to be forgiven?"

[2] Gen. 4:15.

[3] Perhaps an inference from Gen. 4:12 RSV, "When you till the ground, it shall no longer yield to you its strength."

[4] Savile (with V560 and P804) has, "a demonstration."

[5] The words, "as a murderer," have been added in translation.

But as a result of his being left to live for a long time in this trembling, Cain became a teacher[1] to all who encountered him, warning them by his appearance and the shaking of his body never to venture a crime like his, in order never to suffer a punishment like his; and he, too, came to be a better man. For his fear and trembling, his life of constant anxiety, and his physical feebleness, all holding him back like a chain, kept him from rushing into another act of a similar nature, continually reminded him of his past, and by these means led him into a more temperate disposition.[2]

Sec. 3 True confession precedes indictment.--While I was talking it occurred to me to bring up the question, Why is it, after Cain confessed his sin, and condemned what had happened, and averred that he had sinned beyond mercy and deserved no defense, that even with all this he failed to cleanse himself of his sin and was, in fact, condemned--even though the prophet says, "State your sins first, that you may be justified"?[3]

The answer is that he did not do what the prophet requires. The prophet does not say merely, "State your sins," but what? "State your sins first." This is what we are looking for, not merely to speak, but to speak first and not to wait for someone to bring a charge and an accusation. But Cain did not speak first;

---

[1] Some MSS have, "he sat as a teacher."

[2] Lit., "made his soul more sober."

[3] Isa. 43:26. Cf. the RSV, "Set forth your case, that you may be proved right." The Migne text agrees with the LXX. Isa. 43 is quoted also in Sermon vii, p. 210, above.

he waited for God to indict him; indeed, when the accusation came, he denied it! Cain recounted his sin only after God had first indicated clearly what had occurred, and thus it was no longer a "confession."

So you, too, beloved, when you sin, don't wait for your accusation to come from someone else, but before ever you are denounced and accused, condemn what you have done yourself; for if someone else brings the charge, the reformation which takes place will not arise from your confession; your amendment will be due to his accusation.

This is why someone else has said, "A righteous man accuses himself first."[1] What we are looking for then is not for a man to accuse himself, but for him to accuse himself first and not to wait for the reproofs of others. Peter, for example, after that grave denial of his[2] recalled his sin at once, and before anyone else accused him, confessed his error and wept bitterly. In this way he so washed away the denial that he was able to become the chief of the apostles and to have the whole world entrusted to his care.

Back to my theme.--But now for what I was saying before, since I must return to the matter at hand. My argument has proved adequately from this that we must neither neglect nor despise our brothers who have fallen, but that we ought to safeguard them before they sin, and show them much careful attention after they sin.

Doctors act this way. They tell people who are well how to stay well and avoid every kind of disease; and they do not neglect them when they disregard their instructions and get sick. Indeed, they especially show such people great solicitude, so as to rid them of their diseases. Paul did this too. He didn't neglect the man who had committed fornication, but after that sin, after that severe transgression which was not found even among the pagans,[1] and in spite of the fact that the man did not wish to take any treatment, but rebelled, and frisked, and bucked, Paul brought him back into his care, and brought him back in such a way as to unite him again with the body of the Church.[2] Paul didn't say to himself, "What good will it do? What's the use? He has fornicated, he has committed his sin, he does not even want to give up his immorality, but is puffed up and proud, and is making the ulcer incurable. Let us therefore leave him alone and abandon him." Paul didn't say any of this at all. Rather, he showed particularly great attention to this man for the very reason that he saw that he had slipped into unutterable evil. He didn't quit frightening, threatening, and punishing him, on his own and with the help of many others, doing and attempting everything he could, until he had led the man into a recognition of his sin and to an awareness of his transgression, and had at last delivered him from all his defilement.

---

[1] Prov. 18:17.

[2] Matt. 26:69-75.

---

[1] I Cor. 5:1-2 RSV, "It is actually reported that there is immorality among you, and of a kind that is not found even among pagans; for a man is living with his father's wife. And you are arrogant!"

[2] Cf. I Cor. 5:5 RSV, "You are to deliver this man to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus."

You do the same! Imitate that Samaritan who, in the Gospel,[1] demonstrated such concern for the injured man. A Levite and a Pharisee walked past the prostrate man and neither one of them turned aside to him but each mercilessly and cruelly left him and went on his way. But a certain Samaritan, in no way related to the man, did not walk past, but stopped, and showed kindness, and applied oil and wine, and after that set him on his donkey,[2] and led him to an inn, and not only paid cash but also promised to pay more later for the treatment--of this man who was in no way related to him. He didn't say to himself, "Why should I be concerned about this man? I am a Samaritan; I have nothing in common with him. We are far from the city, and he is unable to walk. What if he is not up to the journey--am I to take along with me a dead man? Am I to be convicted of murder? Am I to be held liable for homicide?" For indeed many people, on many occasions when travelling, have seen men injured and gasping for breath, and have hurried on, not because they were afraid to take them along with them or wanted to save the expense, but because they were afraid of being dragged into court on a murder charge. But that tenderhearted and gentle Samaritan feared none of these things. Ignoring them all, he set him on his donkey and led him to the inn, wary neither of danger, expense, nor anything else at all.

If that Samaritan was so tenderhearted and gentle to a stranger, what mercy will we receive if we neglect our own brothers in a

---

[1] Luke 10:29-37.

[2] Some MSS (incl. P804) have, "his shoulders," here and below.

plight far more serious? For truly those who observed the recent 30
fast have fallen among robbers, or rather, among men who are worse than any robbers, among the Jews, who inflict even greater harm on those who fall into their hands than robbers do. The Jews did not tear off their clothes, or beat their bodies like the robbers in the story;[1] they wounded their souls, they inflicted countless injuries on them, and departing, left them lying in the ditch[2] of
irreligion. 38

Sec. 4 Rewards and rumors.--Let us not disregard a tragedy like this! Let us not run past such a pitiful sight without showing mercy! Even if other people do, don't you. Don't say to yourself, "I'm a layman and I have a wife and children.[3] This is a job for priests; this is for the monks." That Samaritan didn't say, "Where are the priests? Where are the Pharisees? Where are the Jewish teachers?" Instead, he pitched in as if he had found a huge treasure and was snatching up a fortune. You, too, then, when you see someone who needs help, either physical or spiritual,
don't say to yourself, "Why doesn't so and so take care of him?" 50
Don't call the others to account for their negligence, but rid him of his disease yourself. If you found a gold coin lying somewhere, tell me, would you say to yourself, "Why doesn't so and so pick it

---

[1] Cf. Luke 10:30 RSV, "A man was going down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and he fell among robbers, who stripped him and beat him, and departed, leaving him half-dead."

[2] Or, "pit." The Greek is λάκκος.

[3] V560 and P804 have, "and little children."

up?" Wouldn't you grab it eagerly before anyone else could? Then think of your fallen brothers in the same way; consider their care like finding a treasure. For if you pour the word of instruction on a brother like oil, and bind him with the bandage of mildness, and treat him with patient perseverance, he will make you more wealthy than any treasure.

"The person who leads out the precious from the vile," the Bible says, "shall be as My mouth."[1] Can anything equal this?

What neither fasting, nor sleeping on the ground, nor vigils,[2] nor anything else, can accomplish, saving your brother can. Think about your mouth; how often and how many times it has sinned; how many shameful words it has uttered; how many blasphemies, how much abuse, it has expressed, and you will surely undertake the care of the fallen. Through this restoration of just one who has fallen,[3] you can cleanse away all this defilement!

But why talk of "cleansing away"? You will make your mouth like the mouth of God. What honor can equal this? And it is not I who promises it; it is God Himself who says, "If you bring even just one, your mouth will be like My mouth, clean and holy."

So let us not neglect our brothers, and neither let us go around saying, "How many took part in the fast! How many were swept away!" Let us look after them. And if there are many who fasted, don't parade it, beloved; don't make a spectacle of the Church's misfortune, but heal it! If someone says, "Many fasted," rebuke him so the report does not become well known. Tell him, "I personally don't know any who did. You are deceived, man. You're telling a lie.[1] You saw two or three who had been swept away, and you say there were many!"

---

[1] Jer. 15:19, quoted freely from the LXX. Cf. the RSV, "If you utter what is precious, and not what is worthless, you shall be as my mouth."

[2] Cf. the practice at the Synagogue of Matrona in Daphne, Sermon i, p. 25, above.

[3] Or, "through this one virtuous act."

Silence the person who brings this accusation, and don't neglect those who were carried away, so that in both ways the Church may be well protected, both by the report's not being broadcast, and by those who were swept away being led back to the sacred flock again.

So let us not go around telling who sinned. Let us show enthusiasm only for the work of restoring those who sinned. For it is a bad habit, a bad one indeed, only to accuse the brethren and not to care for them, to parade the faults of the weak and not to heal them. Let us put an end to this wicked habit, beloved, for the mischief it accomplishes is not slight.

How is it, I ask, that it accomplishes so much mischief? Well, someone hears one of you say that many fasted with the Jews. Without any investigation, he passes the word on to another. In turn he too, without taking the trouble to verify it, tells it to a third. Then as the evil report grows little by little, serious reproach is poured on the Church.[2] There is no advantage in this to those who have been lost, but actual harm both to them and to many others.

---

[1] Or, "You're wrong."

[2] Eleven MSS (incl. V560 and P804) have, "as the evil report about the Church . . . , serious reproach is spread about."

If the number really is small, and by many rumors we make it out to be large, we cause even those who stand to grow weaker, and we give a shove to those who are teetering. After a brother hears that the number that fasted was large, he grows more heedless himself, and after the one who is weak hears it in his turn, he runs to join the crowd of the fallen. Let us, then, not rejoice over this evil, or over any other, in such a way that, if the sinners be numerous, we parade them and say they are many, but let us silence those who say this, and restrain them. Don't tell me that a large number fasted, but correct this large number.[1] I have not been saying all this so that you will accuse a large number but so that you will make the many few, or rather, not make them few, but save them all. So don't parade their sins, but heal those who sinned. For just as the gossips who devote themselves to spreading this story cause the number who sinned to be thought of as large even if it is small, so those who suppress it, who rebuke the gossips and who take care of those who fell, restore the fallen ones even if their numbers are large and allow no one else to get hurt by this rumor.[2]

Haven't you heard that David said in his lament for Saul, "How are the mighty fallen! Proclaim it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Ashkelon, lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice, lest the daughters of the uncircumcized exult"?[1] If, to avoid bringing pleasure to his enemies, David didn't want a well-known event to be broadcast, how much more essential it is for us to suppress this matter, and "build a fence" around it, and not convey it to the ears of the outsiders or, and even more so, to the ears of our own people,[2] lest when our enemies hear it they rejoice, and when our members learn of it, they fall.

---

[1] Many MSS (incl. V560 and P804) have, "this same large number."

[2] Lit., "by the rumor about these."

Don't tell me, "I told so and so." Keep the story to yourself; for just as you didn't manage to keep silent, so the other person won't either.

Sec. 5 I am not saying this in reference to the recent fast alone, but also in relation to countless other sins. Let us not only look to see whether or not many were drawn away, but let us try to find out how we can bring them back. Let us not magnify the enemies' affairs and minimize our own; let us not make them strong and our own side weak, but rather, let us do the very opposite of this in everything. A rumor many times has the power both to destroy and to establish a soul; it can create enthusiasm where none exists, and destroy it where it does. This is why I counsel you to strengthen those reports which exalt our side and make it seem great, and not to exalt those which bring disgrace on the community of brothers. If we hear something good, let us pass it on to everyone; but if we hear something detrimental and bad, let us keep the report to ourselves and do everything we can to remove the basis for it.

---

[1] II Sam. 1:19-20 RSV (II Kings 1:19-20 LXX).

[2] Nine MSS (incl. V560 and P804) read, "to our own people."

What to Do and Say to the Fallen

40 *In ordinary cases*.--So let us go around now carefully searching and looking for those who have fallen, and if we need to enter someone's home, let us not hesitate to do so. If you are not acquainted with the person who lapsed and he is in no way related to you, go to work and find someone who is a friend on good terms with him, someone to whom he especially listens, and take him with you, and go inside that house. Don't be ashamed or embarrassed. If you were going in there to ask for money or to receive a favor from him, you might well be embarrassed, but since you are out on behalf of his salvation, the motive for your entering his home frees you from any stigma.

50 Indeed, you should sit down beside him and say to him (after beginning the conversation with something else so that you can change his mind without arousing his suspicions), "Tell me, do you praise the Jews for crucifying Christ and for, even to this day, blaspheming Him and calling Him a lawbreaker?" Beyond a doubt, if he is a Christian he will refuse to say so. Even if he has Judaized in countless ways, he will refuse to say, "I praise the Jews." He will cover his ears instead and say, "That's absurd, man! Don't even suggest it."

After you have gained his good will,[1] start in again and say,

---

[1] Or, "his assent."

"How is it then that you are able to fellowship with them? How can you share in their festivals and fasts?" Accuse the Jews of arrogance; recount every one of their violations of the law which, in recent days, I have told your Love, every proof of lawlessness which 1
I have derived from the place, the time, the temple, and the predictions of the prophets.[1] Show that there is no rhyme or reason for what the Jews are doing, and that they will never restore their former way of life, and that it is not lawful for them to observe this sort of celebration outside of Jerusalem. Remind them, too, of Gehenna, and of the fearful judgment seat of Christ,[2] and of the trial held there, and of how we shall give an account of all these things, and of that certain punishment (not slight) which awaits those who dare to do such things.

Remind them also of Paul's saying, "You who would be justi- 10
fied by the law; you have fallen away from grace," and, again, of his warning, "If you receive circumcision, Christ will be of no advantage to you."[3] Tell him that Judaic fasting banishes a man from heaven just as much as circumcision does, even though he may have endless virtues. Tell him that we are called Christians, and

---

[1] See especially Sermons iv and v, above.

[2] Cf. II Cor. 5:10 RSV, "for we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, so that each one may receive good or evil, according to what he has done in the body," and Rom. 14:10, 12 RSV, "For we shall all stand before the judgment seat of God; . . . So each of us shall give account of himself to God."

[3] Gal. 5:4, 2 RSV. This passage is cited also in Sermon ii, pp. 42-46, and in Sermon vi, p. 195, above.

are Christians, in order to obey Christ,[1] not in order to run over to those enemies of His.

In cases where the person desires healing.--If he brings up certain services and says to you, "They promised to heal me, and this is why I go over to them," expose their magic trickery, their charms, amulets, and sorcery, for it is only with these things that they are reputed to heal. They do not give a person any true treatment. Far from it!

I shall set up a very hypothetical case and say that even if they do really heal, it is better to die than to run to the enemies of God and be healed in this way. What is the use of having your body cared for while your soul is being destroyed? What is the benefit in gaining some comfort here when you are destined to be sent into immortal fire? Listen to what God says to keep them from saying this: "If a prophet arises among you, or a dreamer of dreams, and gives you a sign or a wonder, and the sign or wonder which he tells you comes to pass, and if he says, 'Let us go and worship other gods . . . ,' you shall not listen to . . . that prophet, . . . for the Lord your God is testing you to see whether you love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul."[2]

What He is saying is that if some prophet says, "I am able to raise the dead or heal the blind, only believe me and let us worship the demons or practice idolatry," if the one who says this *is* able

---

[1] Cf. p. 264, below.

[2] Deut. 13:1-3. This passage is quoted also in Sermon i, p. 34, above.

to heal the blind[1] or raise the dead,[2] do not listen to him even so. Why not? Because God is permitting him to do this in order to test you--not that He does not know your mind, but that you may have a test to help you see whether you really love God. (It is characteristic of a lover not to give up the one he loves even if those who are zealous to draw him[3] away, can raise the dead.) And if He says 50
this to Jews, much more does He say it to us, whom He has led to a greater philosophy, to whom He has opened the door of the Resurrection,[4] and whom He commands not to cherish the things of the present but to fix all our hopes on the life to come.[5]

But what are you saying? That the disease is distressing Sec. 6
you and pressing you hard?

You haven't suffered like blessed Job; indeed, not a fraction as much as he! After the sudden and complete loss of his flocks of sheep, herds of cattle, and everything else, the entire number of his children was snatched away. It all happened on the same day so that not only the nature of the tests but their close succession might overwhelm that champion. After all this he
received a lethal blow in his own body and saw worms bursting out 1

---

[1] V560 adds, "the lame."

[2] V560 and P804 omit, "or raise the dead." [3] Lit., "us."

[4] Cf. Rev. 1:18 RSV, "I died, and behold I am alive for evermore, and I have the keys of Death and Hades."

[5] Cf. Col. 3:2 RSV, "Set your minds on things that are above, not on things that are on earth."

of it all over.[1] Naked upon a dunghill he sat, a public spectacle of woe to anyone at hand,[2] this righteous man, this true,[3] God-fearing man, who abstained from every evil practice.

But not even here did his troubles cease, but pains day and night and a strange, unusual hunger besieged him. "I see my bread," he said, "like a stinking odor."[4] Daily reproaches as well, mockery, jibes, and laughter. "My servants, and the children of my concubines, rise up against me."[5] Terrors in dreams, and a certain stormy agitation of mind continually. Yet his wife, promising freedom from it all, said, "Curse God, and die."[6] That is, "Blaspheme, and you will find release from your afflictions." But did this advice pervert that holy man? On the contrary it fortified him so well that he rebuked his wife; for he preferred to endure pain and distress, and to suffer innumerable woes, rather than find any deliverance from them through blasphemy.

---

[1] Cf. Job 2:9 LXX Thomson, "Thou sittest among the putrefaction of worms, all night long in the open air," and Job 7:5 LXX Thomson, "My body swarms with the putrefaction of worms." The RSV omits this portion of 2:9 and renders 7:5, "My flesh is clothed with worms and dirt." These statements permit the interpretation that the worms pertained to the dung rather than to Job's body, contrary to Chrysostom's assumption.

[2] P804 reads, "to anyone passing by."

[3] V560 reads, "this champion."

[4] Job 6:7. Cf. the RSV, "My appetite refused to touch them; they are as food that is loathsome to me."

[5] Cf. Job 19:16-17 RSV, "I call to my servant, but he gives me no answer; . . . I am repulsive to my wife, loathsome to the sons of my own mother." The LXX has, "of my concubines."

[6] Job 2:9 RSV. Lit., "Speak a word against God, and die."

The man who was ill for thirty-eight years[1] presents a similar case. He used to approach the pool[2] every year, and each time he was frustrated and failed to find healing. Yet although every year he saw others delivered because so many of them had people to assist them, and saw himself continuing in the same unvarying paralysis because he had no one to help him, he did not on this account appeal to a diviner or to the enchanters, or wear an amulet, but waited instead for the help that comes from God. This is why, at the last, he experienced a kind of cure that was wonderful and marvelous.

There is Lazarus,[3] too, who wrestled continually with hunger, disease, and desertion, not merely for thirty-eight years, but for his entire life. In this condition he died at the rich man's door, despised, scoffed at, starving, exposed as food for the dogs. His body was so helpless that he was unable to drive off the dogs who came up and licked his sores. Yet in spite of all he did not appeal to enchanters, or wear amulets, or try magic, or summon sorcerers, or do any of the other forbidden things, but preferred to die surrounded by his troubles than to give up even a small part of his godliness.[4]

If these men, then, remained steadfast when undergoing such great troubles, what mercy shall we have if--for a fever or a sore--

---

[1] John 5.

[2] That is, of Bethesda.

[3] Luke 16:19-31. See also Sermon vii, p. 226, above.

[4] Scripture, of course, does not say whether Lazarus and the man who had been ill for thirty-eight years tried any forbidden remedies or not.

we run over to the synagogues, or call for the magicians and sorcerers
to come to our homes? Haven't you heard what Scripture says? 50
"Son, if you come forward to serve the Lord, prepare yourself for
trial. Set your heart right and be steadfast. In sickness and in
poverty trust in Him. . . . For as gold is tested by fire, so is
an acceptable man, in the furnace of humiliation."[1]

If you flog one of your slaves, and after he has taken thirty
or fifty lashes, he at once either demands manumission or leaves
your service and runs away to people who hate you, and incites them
against you, tell me, will he get any mercy? Will anyone be able
to speak up for him? Of course not. And why so? Because a master
has the right to punish a slave. And also because the slave ought 1
to have gone, not to those who hate you, but to your true friends.

You too,[2] then, when you see God chastening you, don't Sec. 7
seek refuge with His enemies the Jews, lest you aggravate His
anger, but with His friends the martyrs, the saints, and those 10
who have won His approval and have great freedom to speak to
Him.[3]

But why talk about slaves and masters. A son cannot act
like this, or disown his relationship to his father, on the basis
that his father has whipped him. Both the laws of nature and
those laid down by men order him to take it all manfully whether

---

[1] Ecclus. 2:1-2, 5, quoted freely.

[2] In Migne the Latin translation does not begin section 7 here but near the end of the column. See p. 255, n. 1, below.

[3] V560 and P804 omit, "to Him."

his father flogs him, or excludes him from his table, or drives him out of the house, or punishes him in any other way whatever. If he does not submit and obey, no one will show him any mercy; even if a son who has been whipped utters a thousand complaints, everyone tells him, "The person who whipped you is your father and lord. He has the right to do anything whatever to you, and you must take it all meekly."

Then if servants put up with masters, and sons with fathers, who often punish them unfairly, will you not put up with God when He disciplines you--with God, who is of more authority than masters, and who loves you more than fathers, and who is used to doing nothing from anger but everything for your good? If any little sickness comes along, right off will you run away from his service and race over to the demons, and defect to the synagogues? What kind of mercy will you find after doing so? How will you be able to call on Him again? Even if someone should have[1] the boldness Moses had, would he be able to intercede for you? No one could! Don't you hear what God[2] said about the Jews to Jeremiah? "Do not pray for this people; for even if Moses and Samuel stood up, I would not hear them."[3]

There are certain sins, you see, which are utterly beyond pardon and for which no defense can be found. Let us not draw anger of such dimensions upon ourselves.

---

[1] Montfaucon (with V560) reads, "No one, even if he should have."

[2] V560 and P804 omit, "God."

[3] A conflation of Jer. 7:16 and 15:1. Jer. 7 is quoted also in Sermon i, pp. 10, 31, and in Sermon vii, p. 211, above.

Even if the Jews appear to reduce a fever with their enchantments (for they do not reduce it in actual fact), they bring into
your conscience another fever that is worse. And your reason goads
you every day, and your conscience lashes you, saying, "You have
committed sacrilege. You have broken the law. You have trans-
gressed your covenant with Christ. On account of a little sickness,
you have given up your religion. Are you the only one who has suf-
fered this condition? Haven't others suffered far worse than you--
none of whom, in spite of this, have dared to do anything like you 50
did? You frivolous and spineless person, you have sacrificed your
soul. How will you defend yourself to Christ? How will you address Him in your prayers? With what sort of conscience will you set foot in the church? With what kind of eyes will you behold the priest? With what kind of hand will you touch the sacred Table? With what kind of ears will you hear the reading of the Scriptures there?"

Day by day[1] your jabbing reason and your flogging conscience
will ask these questions of you.[2] What, then, is this "health,"
when one has such accusers within? On the other hand, if only you
persevere a little; if only you rebuke those who wish to chant a 1
spell or who want you to wear an amulet, and drive them with great

---

[1] The Latin translation in Migne begins section 7 at this point. Cf. p. 253, n. 2, above.

[2] Five MSS (incl. P804) add, "What fever is this not worse than?"

scorn out of your house, you will receive immediately a refreshing dew from your conscience. Even if the fever burns you times without number, your soul will keep bringing you better and more profitable refreshment than any dew or moisture.

For just as, after accepting the charm, even if you get well, as you reflect on the sin involved you will really be worse off than those who are ill, so now, even if you have a fever and are suffering untold torments, if you ward off those vile people you will be better off than anyone who is well, since your conscience rejoices, your soul exults and makes merry, and your conscience, congratulating and approving you, says, "You there, my man, well done! Well done, you servant of Christ, you man of faith, you champion of godliness! A man who prefers death in torment to betrayal of the religion entrusted to his hands, you shall stand on that Day among the martyrs!"

Just as the martyrs chose to be flogged and tortured in order to be honored, so today you must choose to be flogged and tortured by your fever and sores rather than submit to godless enchanters or accept amulets. Nourished with these expectations, you will not even notice the torments which attack you.[1] If this fever fails to carry you off, another one surely will; if we do not die now, we shall die later on. We received a perishable body, not so that we should acquire godlessness because of its misfortunes, but so that through its troubles we should attain to godliness.

---

[1] Or, "which are laid against you." Three MSS and Savile have, "the pains which are laid upon you."

This very perishability,[1] this very liability of the body to death, will become for us, if we exercise self-control, a basis for our commendation and will give us much freedom to speak on that Day; and not on that Day only, but also in this present life as well. When with much ridicule you drive the charmers out of your house, all who hear about it will admire you, and approve, and will say to one another, "So and so who was sick and ailing, when certain people urged him incessantly and advised and counseled him to make use of certain magical incantations, refused to give his consent and said, 'It is better ~~to~~ die in this condition than to give up religion.'"[2] At this report much applause will break out among those who are listening, and all of them will be amazed and will glorify God. This will bring you greater esteem than how many statues? Greater fame than how many images? More respect than what great honor? All will approve you, and bless and crown you. And they will become better men themselves and will emulate you in their turn, and imitate your manliness. And if another man achieves something similar to what you have done, you will receive a reward as the one who gave birth to his zeal.

They will not only applaud your virtuous actions;[3] they will also be the quick cure of your disease, as the very excellence of your resolution induces God to regard you with increased good will, and as all the saints rejoice together at your eagerness and from the depths of their hearts offer up prayers in your behalf.

---

[1] Lit., "deterioration." The Greek is φθορά.

[2] Or, "my religion." The Greek is τὴν εὐσέβειαν.

[3] Five MSS (incl. P804) and Savile read, "not only applaud, they will follow your virtuous act."

And if there are such rewards for this manliness *here*, consider how many crowns you will receive *there*, when, in the presence of the angels and all[1] the archangels, Christ comes forward and takes you by the hand and leads you into the midst of that audience, and says, with all of them listening, "This man once was taken with a fever, and when countless people advised him to be rid of his disease, for the sake of My name and of My fear--so as to bring no offense to them in any way--he rebuffed those who promised to heal him by that method and drove them out, choosing to die in his disease rather than give up his loyalty to Me." (If[2] Christ presents publicly those who have given Him water to drink, and clothes to wear, and food to eat,[3] much more will He present those who have chosen to endure fevers for His sake. There is no comparison between giving food and clothing, and enduring a long illness! The latter is much greater than the former, and by so much as the toil is greater, by that much will the crown be more illustrious.)

Let us, then, both in health and in sickness, mind these things and tell them to the others. And if we ever see ourselves taken by an unbearable fever, let us say to ourselves, "If an accusation had been brought against us from some source or other, and we had been carried into court, and hung up there, and had our sides torn, would we not have had to endure it without either profit or reward? Let us think about this now." And once a reward for endurance is *added* to this picture, there is enough indeed to encourage a resolution that has flagged.

---

[1] V560 and P804 omit, "all."

[2] Savile (with P804) reads, "Do not marvel; for if."

[3] Matt. 25:31-46.

"But the fever is severe!"

Over against the fire of the fever you must set the fire of Gehenna, which you will certainly escape if you choose to suffer the fever with every endurance. Remember the apostles and how much they went through. Remember the righteous men and how they were always in tribulation. Remember the blessed Timothy and how he enjoyed never a respite from illness, sickness being his constant companion (a situation that Paul makes apparent when he says, "Use a little wine for the sake of your stomach and your frequent ailments."[1]). If that righteous and holy man, to whom the protection of the world was entrusted, while raising the dead, expelling demons, and healing countless diseases in other people, suffered such torments himself, what defense will you have if you become agitated and grieved by an occasional illness? Haven't you listened to the Scriptures when they say, "The Lord disciplines him whom He loves, and chastises every son whom He receives"?[2]

How many there are, how often, who have longed to receive a martyr's crown! Well, here is one way in which a martyr's crown is prepared; for it is not only by being commanded to offer sacrifice and choosing to die instead, that martyrs are made. Maintaining anything whatever, so long as it can bring death, is manifestly a martyrdom as well.

---

[1] I Tim. 5:23 RSV.

[2] Heb. 12:6 RSV.

To see that this is true, bring to mind the death of John Sec. 8
with its why's and wherefore's,[1] and how Abel died.[2] Neither of
these men saw a burning altar or a standing image, or heard an 50
order to sacrifice to demons. The one was decapitated after merely
reproving Herod; the other was murdered after honoring God with a
better sacrifice than his brother's. Have these men, therefore,
been denied their martyr's crowns? Who would dare to say so? It
is beyond doubt indeed that the very manner of their deaths suf-
fices to persuade all men that they are numbered among the fore-
most of the martyrs. If in addition you want to see the divine
judgment decreed in their cases, listen to what Paul says (since
plainly what he says comes from[3] the Spirit. For "I think," he says,
"that I too have the Spirit of God"[4]). What, then, does he say? 1

Starting with Abel and the statements that "Abel offered to God a more acceptable sacrifice than Cain," and that by this means though he is dead, "he is still speaking,"[5] he continues down through the prophets as far as John, saying, "Some were killed with the sword and others were tortured."[6] Then, after describing many different deaths, he adds, "Therefore, since we are surrounded by so great a cloud of martyrs, let us lay aside every weight,[1] . . . and let us run with perseverance."[2]

---

[1] Matt. 14:1-12. [2] Gen. 4:1-16. Cf. pp. 235-39, above.

[3] Some MSS (incl. P804) read, "are the laws of." [4] I Cor. 7:40.

[5] Heb. 11:4. The RSV, on the basis of the same Greek text, says that Abel still speaks "through his faith."

[6] Cf. Heb. 11:37, 35.

Do you see that he calls Abel a martyr, and Noah one too, and Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob? Some of these men died for God as Paul did, who says, "I die every day"[3]; not dying, yet by their willingness alone, enduring death. In the same way, then, if you ward off spells and sorcery and magic and then die of your disease, you too will be a martyr in the fullest sense, because when others promised deliverance with impiety, you chose death with godliness instead.

I have said this for the benefit of those of us who claim assertively that "Demons do heal." And so that you can see that even this assertion is untrue, listen to what Christ says about the devil: "He was a murderer from the beginning."[4] God says he is a murderer, and will you run to him as if he were a physician? What will you find to say when you are called to account, if you held the witchcraft of these men more trustworthy than the pronouncement of Christ? For when God says he is a murderer and, in opposition to God's decree, they say that he can cure diseases, if you accept their tricks and charms, you show nothing else by your actions than that you hold them to be more dependable than He, even if you do not say so in words.

---

[1] Savile (with V560) reads, "fear."

[2] Heb. 12:1. The RSV, on the basis of the same Greek text, gives "witnesses" instead of "martyrs."

[3] I Cor. 15:31 RSV.

[4] John 8:44 RSV.

If the devil is a murderer, it is very plain that the demons who serve him are murderers too. Christ taught you this by the very things they did. For example, when He gave them permission to descend upon the herd of swine, they plunged them all over the cliff, so that you could see that they would have done the same thing to men if God had allowed them to, and would have choked them immediately. At the time He himself restrained and hindered them and did not allow them to do anything of the sort, as they revealed when they were allowed to have their way against the pigs, for if they did not spare the pigs, how much more would they not have kept away from us? And so, beloved, do not be carried away by the deceptions of those men, but be established in the fear of God.

But how will you enter the synagogue anyway?[1]

If you make the sign of the cross[2] on your face, the evil power which inhabits the place will dart away at once. But if you don't make it, and instead lay down your weapon[3] at the doors, the devil will grab you, unprotected and unarmed as you are, and subject you to untold trouble. But why do I have to tell you this? That you yourself consider attending that evil place to be the greatest of sins is clear from the way you enter it. You are so anxious to remain unobserved, and you urge your servants, friends, and neighbors, not to report you to the priests; and if anyone does tell on you, you are thoroughly annoyed. How foolish it is--since God is watching and is present everywhere--for you to try to escape the attention of men, and blatantly to venture this unlawful deed!

---

[1] That is, if you insist on doing so.

[2] Greek, σφραγίζω. Sophocles.

[3] That is, the sign of the cross.

But you are not afraid of God? Then at least feel some shame before the Jews themselves. With what kind of eyes will you look at them? With what kind of mouth will you talk to them--claiming to be a Christian yet running to their synagogues[1] and begging them for help? Don't you stop to think how much laughter, how many jibes, how much exulting, how much impudence, how much derision they indulge in at your expense, if not openly, at least in their minds?

Tell me, is this supportable, or tolerable? Why, if one Sec. 9
had to die ten thousand deaths, or suffer utterly incurable diseases, would it not be far better to endure every suffering than to become the butt of jokes and an object of ridicule for these polluted people, and live with an evil conscience besides?

The Closing Appeal

I say this, not only so you can hear it yourselves, but also so you will heal those who have this disease.[2] For just as I blame them for being sick as respects the Faith, so I blame you for not wanting to set them right. Is it what we are looking for, beloved, for you to come here and listen to what is said? This in itself is a reproach when action is not added to the hearing of the word spoken.[1] This is why you are a Christian,[2] to imitate Christ and obey His laws. And what did He do? He didn't sit in Jerusalem and call the sick to Him, but went around to the cities and villages and healed both kinds of illness, both physical and spiritual. Though He could have stayed in one place and drawn everyone to Himself, He did not do so, showing us by example that we ought to go about and look for the lost.[3]

---

[1] Savile (with V560) reads, "to their things."

[2] That is, the metaphorical disease of Judaizing. See especially Sermon i, above.

Christ intimated the same thing in the parable of the shepherd.[4] He didn't stay with the ninety-nine sheep and wait for the wandering one to come to Him, but went out Himself and found it, and having found it, laid it on His shoulders and carried it back. Don't you see physicians doing the same also? They don't require patients to be carried on their beds to the doctors' homes, but they themselves hurry over to where the patients are.

So you do the same, beloved, aware that the present life is short and that if we don't reap these advantages here we shall have no salvation there.

Many times the winning of a single soul can wipe out the

---

[1] Cf. James 1:22 RSV, "Be doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving yourselves."

[2] Cf. p. 249, above.

[3] Cf. Luke 19:10 RSV, "The Son of man came to seek and to save the lost," and Acts 10:38 RSV, "He went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed by the devil."

[4] Luke 15:4-7.

weight of any number of sins[1] and save our souls[2] on that Day. Con-
sider the reason why prophets, why apostles, why righteous men, why
angels, were sent so frequently, and why the Only Begotten Son of
God Himself came. Was it not to save men? Was it not to bring back
those who had wandered away? Then you do the same so far as you can, 1
and show every zeal and care for the return of those who have wan-
dered.

I do not cease to bring you these counsels at every meeting,
whether you listen or whether you don't, and I shall not cease speak-
ing, for it is God's law for me to fulfill this ministry whether you
will hear or whether you will not.[3] However, if you both hear and
practice what is preached, I shall perform this very thing with great
pleasure; but if you are careless and irresponsible, in great dis- 10
couragement.

Henceforth your disobedience does not entail any danger to me, because I have fulfilled my whole duty;[4] yet even though I am in no danger having now completed my task, I grieve at the thought of your being accused of this on that Day. For this sermon will not be free of danger to you, if that supplementing of it through works fails to materialize. Listen to the way Christ accuses those teachers who hide the Word, and how He instills fear in the learners who are being taught. When He says, "You ought to have invested My money with the bankers," He adds, "and at My coming I should have demanded it with interest,"[1] showing that after the preaching of the sermon (for this is the "investing of the money"), those who have received the instruction must produce interest on it. And the interest on instruction is nothing other than works. If, then, I too have invested the money in your ear, from now on you must pay interest on it (that is, the salvation of your brothers) to the Master.

---

[1] Cf. James 5:19-20 RSV, "My brethren, if any one among you wanders from the truth and some one brings him back, let him know that whoever brings back a sinner from the error of his way will save his soul from death and will cover a multitude of sins."

[2] Lit., "become a substitute [ἀντίφυχον, Lampe] for us."

[3] Cf. Ezek. 2:7 RSV, "You shall speak my words to them, whether they hear or refuse to hear," and 3:19 RSV, "If you warn the wicked, and he does not turn from his wickedness, or from his wicked way, he shall die in his iniquity; but you will have saved your life."

[4] Cf. Acts 20:26-27 RSV, "I testify to you this day that I am innocent of the blood of all of you, for I did not shrink from declaring to you the whole counsel of God." Cf. Sermon i, p. 37, above.

So if you continue only to retain what is said and do not produce anything in yourselves,[2] I am afraid that you will suffer the same punishment as the man who buried his talent.[3] For not conveying to others what he had heard, he was bound hand and foot and led away into the outer darkness. So that we, then, may not suffer the same fate, let us imitate the man who received the five talents, and the one who received the two, and even if we need to spend argument, possessions, physical toil, prayer, and anything else whatever for our neighbor's salvation, let us not hesitate to do so--so that by all means each one of us may be able, after multiplying proportionately the talent God has given us, to hear His blessed voice saying,

---

[1] Matt. 25:27, quoted freely. Cf. Sermon i, p. 37, above.

[2] V560 and P804 have, "in them."

[3] For the parable of the talents, see Matt. 25:14-30.

"Well done, good and faithful servant; you have been faithful over a little, I will set you over much; enter into the joy of your Master."[1]

May this happen to all of us, by the grace and lovingkindness of our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom and with whom be glory and power to the Father, together with the Holy Spirit, for ever and ever, Amen.

---

[1] Matt. 25:23 RSV.

TABLE OF SCRIPTURE CITATIONS

AND

BIBLIOGRAPHY

TABLE OF SCRIPTURE CITATIONS

AS LISTED IN THE FOOTNOTES

Old Testament

Text	Sermon	Page
Gen. 1:11	vi	190
Gen. 1:26	vii	208
Gen. 2:16-17	viii	234
Gen. 4:1-16	viii	260
Gen. 4:4-5	viii	235
Gen. 4:5	i	30
Gen. 4:7	viii	235
Gen. 4:9-10	viii	236
Gen. 4:12	viii	237
Gen. 4:13-14	viii	237
Gen. 4:15	viii	237
Gen. 8:21	i	30
Gen. 14	vii	214
Gen. 14:1-17	vii	216
Gen. 14:17-20	vii	219
Gen. 14:18-24	vii	216
Gen. 15:13-14, 16	v	127
Ex. 3:22	v	127
Ex. 3:7-8	v	134
Ex. 5:16, 14	v	127
Ex. 5:16	v	127
Ex. 13:21	vi	174
Ex. 14	v	124
Ex. 15:1	v	127
Ex. 15:11	v	117
Ex. 17:4	vi	173
Ex. 17:22	vi	180
Ex. 23:14-17	vii	201
Ex. 25-30	iv	104
Ex. 28:15	vi	186
Ex. 29:38-42	v	141
Ex. 30:12-14	v	165
Ex. 32	vi	182
Ex. 32:1	v	124
Ex. 32:6	iv	100

Text	Sermon	Page
Ex. 40:34-35	vi	181
Ex. 40:34-38	iv	104
Lev. 2:1	vii	202
Lev. 7:25	vi	189
Lev. 8:1-34	vi	189
Lev. 8:8	vi	180
Lev. 8:16-17	vi	188
Lev. 10:1-3	v	160
Lev. 12	vii	201
Lev. 14	vii	201
Lev. 15	vii	201
Lev. 23:5-6	iv	96
Lev. 23:16	iv	91
Lev. 25:24	v	165
Lev. 25:51-52	v	165
Lev. 26:29	v	133
Lev. 27:30	v	165
Lev. 27:30	vii	215
Num. 1	vii	215
Num. 3:5-10	vii	215
Num. 3:5-13	vii	219
Num. 5:12-14	vii	202
Num. 5:15-28	vii	203
Num. 7:89	vi	180
Num. 9:7-11	iii	72
Num. 9:7-11	iv	93
Num. 10:2-5, 10	iv	104
Num. 11:25	vi	182
Num. 16	vi	190
Num. 16:39	vi	191
Num. 17	vi	189
Num. 18:15	v	165
Num. 18:26-32	vii	215
Num. 25:3	vi	173
Deut. 12:11	iv	91
Deut. 13:1-3	i	33, 34
Deut. 13:1-3	viii	249
Deut. 13:2-4	i	33
Deut. 13:3	i	34
Deut. 13:4	i	34
Deut. 16:5-6	iii	64
Deut. 16:5-6	iv	91
Deut. 16:6	iv	91
Deut. 28:49-50, 60	v	132
Deut. 28:56	v	133

Text	Sermon	Page
Deut. 28:57	v	133
Deut. 30:3	v	128
Deut. 30:19	i	36
Deut. 32:15	iv	90
Deut. 32:18	iii	65
Joshua 6	vi	174
Joshua 6:20	vi	174
Joshua 9	vi	174
I Sam. 4-7	vi	194
II Sam. 1:19-20	viii	246
II Sam. 6:16	i	18
I Kings 18:21	iv	90
I Kings 18:38	iv	104
I Kings 20:30-34	iv	82
I Kings 20:35-38	iv	83
I Kings 20:39-42	iv	84
II Kings 1:19-20	viii	246
II Kings 18:13-19:37	vi	179
II Kings 22	iv	85
II Chron. 5:14	vi	181
II Chron. 7:1-2	iv	104
Ezra 7	v	151, 153
Ezra 10:11	i	19
Neh. 2	v	151
Neh. 2:1-5	v	153
Neh. 6:15	v	153
Job 2:9	i	35
Job 2:9	viii	251
Job 6:7	viii	251
Job 7:5	viii	251
Job 19:16-17	viii	251
Job 40:8	i	36
Ps. 2:3	i	7
Ps. 11:7	v	108
Ps. 12:6	v	108
Ps. 39:6	vii	205
Ps. 39:7	vii	205, 206
Ps. 39:7	vii	213
Ps. 39:8	vii	208
Ps. 39:9	vii	208
Ps. 39:10	vii	208
Ps. 40:3-4	vii	205
Ps. 40:5	vii	205
Ps. 40:6	vii	205, 206
Ps. 40:6	vii	213

Text	Sermon	Page
Ps. 40:6-7	vii	207
Ps. 40:7	vii	208
Ps. 40:8	vii	208
Ps. 40:9	vii	208, 211
Ps. 49:16-20	vii	212
Ps. 50:9	vii	211
Ps. 50:16-20	vii	212
Ps. 50:18, 21	i	20
Ps. 77:24-25	vi	174
Ps. 78:13-16	vi	173
Ps. 78:14	vi	174
Ps. 78:24-25	vi	174
Ps. 91:11-12	vi	192
Ps. 94:10	vi	173
Ps. 95:10	vi	173
Ps. 104:37	v	128
Ps. 105:30	vi	176
Ps. 105:37	iii	65
Ps. 105:37	v	128
Ps. 106:30	vi	176
Ps. 106:37	iii	65
Ps. 109:1	vii	218
Ps. 109:3-4	vii	218
Ps. 110:1	vii	217, 218
Ps. 110:3-4	vii	217, 218
Ps. 136:3	iv	94
Ps. 136:4	iv	94
Ps. 137:3	iv	94
Ps. 137:4	iv	94
Ps. 139:6	i	1
Ps. 139:14	i	1
Prov. 18:17	viii	239
Prov. 18:19	iii	54
Isa. 1:10	iv	99
Isa. 1:10-11	vii	210
Isa. 1:11, 12	iv	99
Isa. 1:11-13	vii	210
Isa. 1:13	i	29
Isa. 1:13	v	164
Isa. 1:15	vii	212
Isa. 1:23, 25	i	20
Isa. 6:3	i	2
Isa. 8:2	v	125
Isa. 14:27	v	159
Isa. 28:1	viii	230

Text	Sermon	Page
Isa. 29:9	viii	230
Isa. 41:23	i	33
Isa. 42:19	iii	64
Isa. 43	viii	238
Isa. 43:22-23	vii	210
Isa. 43:26	viii	238
Isa. 44:9-20	v	155
Isa. 48:4-5	v	125
Isa. 51:21	viii	230
Isa. 53:5-7	vi	184
Isa. 53:8	i	1
Isa. 53:8	vi	184, 185
Isa. 53:9	vi	185
Isa. 56:10	iv	99
Isa. 58:4-5	i	8
Isa. 60:1-3	i	5
Jer. 2:10, 11	iv	88
Jer. 2:20	i	7
Jer. 3:3	i	10
Jer. 5:5	i	7
Jer. 5:8	i	28
Jer. 5:8	iv	99
Jer. 6:20	vii	210
Jer. 7	vii	211
Jer. 7	viii	254
Jer. 7:4	i	31
Jer. 7:11	i	10, 31
Jer. 7:16	i	31
Jer. 7:16	viii	254
Jer. 7:20	vii	211
Jer. 7:21	i	31
Jer. 10:5	i	33
Jer. 12:7	i	10
Jer. 12:9	i	10
Jer. 14:11-12	v	129
Jer. 15:1	viii	254
Jer. 15:19	viii	243
Jer. 17:19-27	vi	176
Jer. 29:10, 14	v	128
Jer. 31:18	i	8
Jer. 36:10	v	128
Jer. 44:16-18	v	125
Jer. 51:16-18	v	125
Lam. 4:10	v	133
Ezek. 2:7	viii	265

Text	Sermon	Page
Ezek. 3:12	i	2
Ezek. 3:19	viii	265
Ezek. 16	vi	173
Ezek. 23	vi	173
Ezek. 23:39	vi	173
Ezek. 36:21	vi	177
Ezek. 36:22	vi	176
Dan. 2:2-4, 7	iv	95
Dan. 2:21-29	iv	97
Dan. 3:17-18	iv	98
Dan. 3:32	v	132
Dan. 8:2-5	v	136
Dan. 8:5	v	136
Dan. 8:6-7	v	137
Dan. 8:8	v	137
Dan. 8:9	v	137
Dan. 8:11-12	v	137
Dan. 8:27	v	129
Dan. 9:1-2	v	129
Dan. 9:4	v	130
Dan. 9:5-6	v	130
Dan. 9:11	v	132
Dan. 9:12	v	132
Dan. 9:15	v	134
Dan. 9:17	v	149
Dan. 9:17-18	v	134
Dan. 9:24	v	149, 150
Dan. 9:24	v	151
Dan. 9:25	v	151, 154
Dan. 9:26	v	154
Dan. 9:27	v	155
Dan. 11-12	v	147
Dan. 11:31-36	v	139
Dan. 12:8-10	v	141
Dan. 12:11	v	141
Dan. 12:11-12	v	142
Dan. 12:12	v	142
Hos. 4:14	vii	202, 203
Hos. 4:16	i	8
Joel 1:14	i	9
Joel 2:11	v	160
Amos 4:5	vii	201
Amos 5:21	i	29
Amos 5:22	vii	211
Amos 5:23	i	29

Text	Sermon	Page
Micah 6:7-8	vii	211
Zeph. 2:11	v	165
Zech. 7:5	iv	95
Mal. 1:9, 11-12	v	163
Mal. 3:14-15	v	131
Mal. 4:2	i	5

Apocrypha

Text	Sermon	Page
Ecclus. 2:1-2, 5	viii	253
Azar. 9	v	132
Azar. 15	iv	94
Azar. 26	iv	97
I Macc. 1-6	v	135
I Macc. 1:34-59	v	142
I Macc. 1:54	v	137
I Macc. 1:54, 59	v	151
I Macc. 4-7	v	142
I Macc. 4:52	v	151
II Macc. 4-9	v	135
II Macc. 7	v	115

New Testament

Text	Sermon	Page
Matt. 5:23	iii	75
Matt. 5:23, 24	ii	48
Matt. 5:32	ii	49
Matt. 5:34	i	12
Matt. 7:23	vi	195
Matt. 8:12	i	15
Matt. 8:32	i	32
Matt. 10:34-35	v	120
Matt. 11:13	v	150
Matt. 11:28	i	7
Matt. 12:26	iii	54
Matt. 12:43-45	i	27
Matt. 13:5	vii	228
Matt. 14:1-12	viii	260
Matt. 15:26	i	6
Matt. 16:18	v	114
Matt. 18:6	iii	55
Matt. 18:14	iii	55
Matt. 18:20	iii	63
Matt. 18:32	iii	71

Text	Sermon	Page
Matt. 21:13	i	10
Matt. 21:13	vi	196
Matt. 22:11-13	iii	72
Matt. 22:13	i	15
Matt. 22:45	vii	217
Matt. 23:25	iii	71
Matt. 23:28	i	10
Matt. 23:31	v	149
Matt. 23:32	v	149
Matt. 24:2	v	111
Matt. 24:15	v	155
Matt. 24:23	i	4
Matt. 24:33	ii	40
Matt. 25:1-13	iii	71
Matt. 25:12	vi	195
Matt. 25:13	i	15
Matt. 25:14-30	viii	266
Matt. 25:23	viii	267
Matt. 25:27	viii	266
Matt. 25:31-46	viii	258
Matt. 25:45	iii	55
Matt. 26:9-10, 13	v	112
Matt. 26:69-75	viii	239
Matt. 27:12	vi	184
Matt. 27:13	vi	184
Matt. 27:25	i	20
Matt. 27:25	vi	170
Mark 3:26	iii	54
Mark 9:44	i	15
Mark 13:2	v	111
Luke 2:14	i	2
Luke 3:25, 27	vi	195
Luke 10:29-37	viii	241
Luke 10:30	viii	242
Luke 11:18	iii	54
Luke 11:24-26	i	27
Luke 15:4-7	viii	264
Luke 16:9	vii	226
Luke 16:19-21	vii	226
Luke 16:19-31	viii	252
Luke 16:23	vii	226
Luke 18:9-14	iii	63
Luke 19:10	viii	264
Luke 19:27	i	8
Luke 19:40	v	150

Text	Sermon	Page
Luke 21:24	v	110
Luke 22:1	iii	66
John 1:12	i	6
John 1:17	vii	207
John 2:16	vi	196
John 3:16	iii	70
John 4:21, 24	v	166
John 5	viii	252
John 5:18	i	5
John 8:19	i	11
John 8:44	viii	261
John 10:11, 14	iii	53
John 15:1-8	i	5
John 15:13	iv	97
John 19:6	i	20
John 19:15	i	7
John 19:22-24	iii	56
Acts 5:35-39	v	118
Acts 7:51	i	7
Acts 7:51	iv	91
Acts 8:3	ii	45
Acts 9	iii	74
Acts 9:36-41	vii	227
Acts 9:39-40	vii	227
Acts 10:38	viii	264
Acts 16:17	vi	193
Acts 16:18, 17	vi	193
Acts 20:26	i	36
Acts 20:26-27	viii	265
Acts 20:27	i	37
Acts 22:4	ii	45
Acts 26:10	ii	45
Rom. 1:32	i	20
Rom. 3:20	ii	44
Rom. 3:21	vii	209
Rom. 3:23	ii	43
Rom. 5:8	iii	69
Rom. 8:38, 29	i	35
Rom. 11:6	ii	44
Rom. 11:16, 17	i	5
Rom. 11:33	i	2
Rom. 11:33	vii	207
Rom. 14:15	i	38
Rom. 14:15	iii	55
Rom. 14:10, 12	viii	248

Text	Sermon	Page
Rom. 15:6	ii	52
I Cor. 1:10	iii	59
I Cor. 1:13	iii	59
I Cor. 3:19	v	160
I Cor. 4:18	iii	58
I Cor. 5:1	iii	58
I Cor. 5:1-2	viii	240
I Cor. 5:5	viii	240
I Cor. 5:6	iii	55
I Cor. 5:7	iii	67
I Cor. 5:8	iii	65
I Cor. 6:1	iii	58
I Cor. 7:12	ii	49
I Cor. 7:40	viii	260
I Cor. 8:10	i	23
I Cor. 8:11	i	38
I Cor. 8:11	iii	55
I Cor. 9:20-21	v	117
I Cor. 10:21	i	32
I Cor. 10:21	iii	58
I Cor. 10:24	vii	225
I Cor. 11:3	ii	49
I Cor. 11:4-5	iii	58
I Cor. 11:21	iii	58
I Cor. 11:22	iii	58
I Cor. 11:26	iii	66, 67
I Cor. 12:12-21	i	14
I Cor. 12:29	iii	58
I Cor. 14:20	vi	195
I Cor. 14:35	ii	50
I Cor. 15:31	viii	261
I Cor. 15:35	iii	58
I Cor. 16:22	ii	52
II Cor. 1:14	vii	226
II Cor. 3:10	v	165
II Cor. 5:10	iv	103
II Cor. 5:10	viii	248
II Cor. 6:16	vi	196
II Cor. 10:5	vi	168
II Cor. 11:29	iv	106
II Cor. 11:29	vii	225
Gal. 1:14	iii	74
Gal. 2:19	ii	45
Gal. 2:21	ii	44
Gal. 3:23	ii	43

Text	Sermon	Page
Gal. 3:23	ii	44
Gal. 4:10-11	iii	66
Gal. 4:12	iii	60
Gal. 4:21	ii	44
Gal. 4:25	i	18
Gal. 4:26	i	18
Gal. 5:1	ii	45
Gal. 5:2	iii	65
Gal. 5:2	ii	42
Gal. 5:3	ii	46
Gal. 5:4	ii	44, 52
Gal. 5:4	vi	195
Gal. 5:4, 2	viii	248
Gal. 5:9	iii	55
Gal. 5:15	iii	56
Gal. 6:9	viii	233
Gal. 6:14	iii	69
Gal. 6:17	iii	62
Eph. 1:22-23	i	14
Eph. 4:15-16	i	14
Eph. 5:18	viii	230
Eph. 5:30-32	i	14
Phil. 3:2-3	i	6
Phil. 3:5-6	ii	45
Phil. 3:5-7	iii	61
Phil. 3:7	iii	74
Col. 1:18	i	14
Col. 2:16-17	iii	66
Col. 3:2	viii	250
Col. 3:3-4	vi	185
I Thess. 5:11	ii	50
I Tim. 2:4	vii	229
I Tim. 5:23	viii	259
I Tim. 6:16	i	2
II Tim. 4:8	vi	170
Tit. 1:13	ii	51
Tit. 2:11-12	v	166
Heb. 1:1	vii	207
Heb. 5:6, 11	vii	218
Heb. 7:1-2	vii	219
Heb. 7:4	vii	219
Heb. 7:4-5	vii	220
Heb. 7:7	vii	221
Heb. 7:9	vii	221
Heb. 7:10	vii	221

Text	Sermon	Page
Heb. 7:11	vii	221, 222
Heb. 7:12	vii	222
Heb. 7:13-14	vii	223
Heb. 7:15-16	vii	223
Heb. 9:1-5	iv	104
Heb. 9:13-14	vii	214
Heb. 10:1, 5	vii	209
Heb. 10:5	vii	206
Heb. 10:6	vii	213
Heb. 10:9	vii	213
Heb. 10:10	vii	214
Heb. 10:12-13	vii	218
Heb. 11:4	viii	260
Heb. 11:37, 35	viii	260
Heb. 12:1	viii	261
Heb. 12:3	viii	233
Heb. 12:6	viii	259
Heb. 13:5	i	36
James 1:22	viii	264
James 5:19-20	viii	265
I Peter 5:8	iii	56
II Peter 1:3	i	5
I John 4:17	iv	103
I John 4:17	vii	225
I John 5:7	i	2
Rev. 1:18	viii	250
Rev. 18:2	i	11

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ancient Works

Ammianus Marcellinus. History. Text, edited by C. U. Clark, with an English translation by John C. Rolfe. (Loeb Classical Library.) 3 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1935-1939.

Cassius Dio Cocceianus. Roman History. Edited by Ursulus P. Boissevain. 4 vols. Berlin: Weidmannscheverlagsbuchhandlung, 1955.

Cyprian. On Unity. Edited, with translation and notes, by E. H. Blakeney. ("Texts for Students," No. 43.) London: S. P. C. K., 1928.

Eusebius. Ecclesiastical History. Edited by Eduard Schwartz. ("Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte," Nos. 7, 9.) 2 vols. Pp. 1-904. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1902-1908.

________. Ecclesiastical History. Edited by Gustave Bardy. ("Sources chrétiennes," Nos. 31, 41, 55, 72.) 4 vols. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1952-60.

________. Life of Constantine. Edited by Ivar A. Heikel. ("Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte," No. 7.) Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1902. Pp. 1-148.

________. Martyrs of Palestine. Edited by Eduard Schwartz. ("Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte," No. 9.) Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1908. Pp. 905-1040.

________. Martyrs of Palestine. Edited with French translation and notes by Gustave Bardy. ("Sources chrétiennes," No. 55.) Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1958.

John Chrysostom. On the Priesthood. Edited by J. A. Nairn. ("Cambridge Patristic Texts," No. 4.) Cambridge: At the University Press, 1906.

Josephus. Works. Text with an English translation and notes by H. St. J. Thackeray, Ralph Marcus, and Allen Wickren. (Loeb Classical Library.) 9 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1926-1965.

Julius Africanus. Chronography. Edited with notes by M. J. Routh. Reliquiae sacrae. 2nd ed. Vol. II.

________. *Chronography.* Translated with introduction and notes by S. D. Salmond; rev. and annotated by A. Cleveland Coxe. (The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. VI.) Reprint; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957.

Justin. *Dialogue.* Edited with French translation and notes by Georges Archambault. ("Textes et Documents pour l'Étude historique du Christianisme.") 2 vols. Paris: Librairie Alphonse Picard et Fils, 1909.

The Letter of Aristeas. Translated with introduction and notes by H. St. J. Thackeray. ("Translations of Early Documents, Series II, Hellenistic-Jewish Documents.") London: S. P. C. K., 1917.

Palladius. *Dialogue Concerning the Life of Chrysostom.* Edited with revised text, introduction, notes, indices and appendices by P. R. Coleman-Norton. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1928.

________. *Dialogue Concerning the Life of Chrysostom.* Translated by Herbert Moore. ("Translations of Christian Literature, Series I, Greek Texts.") London: S. P. C. K., 1921.

Philostorgius. *Ecclesiastical History.* Edited by J. Bidez. ("Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte," No. 19.) Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1913.

Socrates. *Ecclesiastical History.* Edited, with notes, by Robert Hussey. 3 vols. Oxford: E. Typographeo Academico, 1853.

________. *Ecclesiastical History.* Translated with introduction and notes by A. C. Zenos. (A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, 2nd Series, Vol. II.) Reprint; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1952.

Sozomen. *Ecclesiastical History.* Edited by Joseph Bidez, assisted by Gunther Christian Hansen. ("Griechischer christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte," No. 50.) Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1960.

________. *Ecclesiastical History.* Translated with introduction and notes by Chester D. Hartranft. (A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, 2nd Series, Vol. II.) Reprint; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1952.

Theodoret. *Ecclesiastical History.* Edited by Leon Parmentier. ("Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte," No. 44.) Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1954.

The Theodosian Code. Edited by P. Krueger. 3 vols. Berlin: Weidmanns, 1923-26.

The Theodosian Code. Translated with commentary, glossary, and bibliography, by Clyde Pharr, in collaboration with Theresa Sherrer Davidson and Mary Brown Pharr, with an introduction by C. Dickerman Williams. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1952.

Recent Works

The Apocrypha of the Old Testament. *The Revised Standard Version*. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1957.

Arndt, William, and Gingrich, F. Wilbur (trans. and eds.). *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. A translation and adaptation of Walter Bauer's *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*, 4th rev. and augmented ed., 1952. Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Baron, S. W. *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*. Vol. II. 2nd ed. rev. and enlarged. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publishing Company of America, 1952.

Baur, Chrysostomus. *John Chrysostom and His Time*. English translation by M. Gonzaga. 2 vols. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1959-1960.

Boak, A. E. R. "Foreword," in C. D. Gordon. *The Age of Attila*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: The University of Michigan Press, 1960.

Bright, William. *The Canons of the First Four General Councils*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892.

Brightman, F. E. (ed.). *Liturgies Eastern and Western*. Edited on the basis of a former work by C. E. Hammond. Vol. I. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1896.

Burns, M. A. *Saint John Chrysostom's Homilies on the Statues: A Study of Their Rhetorical Qualities and Form*. ("Catholic University of America Patristic Studies," No. 22.) Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America, 1930.

Bury, J. B. *History of the Later Roman Empire*. Vol. I. 1st ed. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1958.

Butler, G. Paul (ed.). *Best Sermons*. Vol. IX. Protestant ed. Princeton, N. J.: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1964.

Cadoux, C. J. *The Early Church and the World*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1925.

Canet, L. "Pour l'edition de S. Jean Chrysostome *Adversus Judaeos*," *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'Ecole Française de Rome*, XXXII (1914), 97-133.

Cohen, Simon. "Calendar," *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*. 10 vols. New York: The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Inc., 1939-1943. II, 630-34.

Conybeare, F. C. (ed.). *The Dialogues of Athanasius and Zacchaeus and of Timothy and Aquila*. ("*Anecdota Oxoniensia*.") Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1898.

Cross, F. L. (ed.). *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. London: Oxford University Press, 1957.

Dickinson, F. W. A. *The Use of the Optative Mood in the Works of St. John Chrysostom*. ("Catholic University of America Patristic Studies," No. 11.) Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America, 1926.

Downey, Glanville. *A History of Antioch in Syria*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1961.

Duchesne, Louis. *Early History of the Christian Church*. English translation from the 4th ed., Vol. II. London: John Murray, Albermarle St., 1912.

Enelow, H. G. "Dancing," *The Jewish Encyclopedia*. 12 vols. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1901-1906. IV, 424-26.

Festugière, A. J. *Antioche Païenne et Chrétienne*. ("Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athenes et de Rome," No. 194.) Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard, 1959.

Froom, Leroy Edwin. *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*. 4 vols. Washington, D. C.: The Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1946-1954.

Goggin, St. Thomas Aquinas (trans.). *St. John Chrysostom's Commentary on St. John*. (The Fathers of the Church.) 2 vols. New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc., 1957-1959.

Goodman, Paul. *History of the Jews*. Rev. and enlarged by Israel Cohen. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1953.

Goodspeed, Edgar J. *As I Remember*. New York: Harper & Brothers, Pubs., 1953.

__________. *The New Testament in Modern Speech*. New York: Harper & Brothers, Pubs., n.d.

Grant, Robert M. "The Problem of Theophilus," *The Harvard Theological Review*, XLIII (July, 1950), 179-96.

"Great Sabbath," *The Standard Jewish Encyclopedia*. Edited by Cecil Roth, *et al*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1959. P. 1634.

Haddad, George. *Aspects of Social Life in Antioch in the Hellenistic-Roman Period*. New York: Hafner Publishing Co., 1949.

The Holy Bible, The Revised Standard Version. The Old and New Testaments. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1952.

Horn, Siegfried. "Abraham," *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Dictionary*. Edited by S. Horn. Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1960. Pp. 8-11.

Horn, Siegfried. "Jerusalem," *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Dictionary*. Edited by S. Horn. Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1960. PP. 554-64.

________ and Lynn H. Wood. *The Chronology of Ezra 7*. Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1953.

James, M. R. *The Apocryphal New Testament*. Corrected ed. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1955.

Joseph, Max. "Sabbath," *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*. 10 vols. New York: The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Inc., 1939-1943. II, 630-34.

Ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη. The text of the New Testament, edited by Erwin Nestle, with critical apparatus by G. D. Kilpatrick. London: The British and Foreign Bible Society, 1958.

Kraeling, Carl H. "The Jewish Community at Antioch," *The Journal of Biblical Literature*, LI (1932), 130-160.

Lampe, G. W. H. (ed.). *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. First 3 fascicles. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1961-

Liddell, Henry George, and Scott, Robert (eds.). *A Greek-English Lexicon*. New ed. rev. and augmented by Henry Stuart Jones, with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie, *et al*. 2 vols. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1940.

Leutsch, E. L. von, and Schneidewing, F. G. *Corpus Paroemiographi Graecorum*. 3 vols. Göttingen, 1839-1851.

Margolis, M. L., and Marx, A. *A History of the Jewish People*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publishing Society of America, 1945.

Moffatt, James. *A New Translation of the Bible*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1934.

Nestle, Erwin. See *Ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη*.

The New English Bible. The New Testament. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Nida, Eugene A. *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964.

Percival, Henry R. (trans.). *The Seven Ecumenical Councils of the Undivided Church*. (A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, 2nd Series, Vol. XIV.) Reprint, Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956.

Phillips, J. B. *The New Testament in Modern English*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1961.

________. *Four Prophets*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1963.

Plass, Ewald M. (ed.). *What Luther Says*. 3 vols. St. Louis, Mo. Concordia Publishing House, 1959.

Puech, Aimè. *St. Jean Chrysostome et les moeurs de son temps*. Paris: Librairie Hachette et Cie, 1891.

Quasten, Johannes. *Patrology*. 3 vols. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1960-1962.

Raab, D. Leopold. *Universal-Kalender fuer die julianische, gregorianische und juedische, juedisch-julianische und juedisch-gregorianische Zeitrechnung*. Budapest, 1887.

Rahlfs, Alfred (ed.). *Septuaginta*. 2 vols., 5th ed. New York: The American Bible Society, 1952.

Rappoport, Julius. "Oath," *The Jewish Encyclopedia*. 12 vols. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1901-1906. IX, 365-67.

Rauschen, Gerhardt. *Jahrbücher der Christlichen Kirche unter dem Kaiser Theodosius dem grossen*. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder'sche Verlagschandlung, 1897.

Revel, Hirschel. "Fasting and Fast Days," *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*. 10 vols. New York: The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Inc., 1939-1943. IV, 249-52.

Robertson, E. H. *The New Translations of the Bible*. ("Studies in Ministry and Worship.") London: S. C. M. Press, Ltd., 1959.

Schwartz, E. *Christliche und jüdische Ostertafeln*. ("Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der wissenschaften zu göttingen philologisch-historische Klasse," New Series, Vol. VIII, No. 6.) Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1905.

Seaver, J. E. *Persecution of the Jews in the Roman Empire (300-438)*. ("University of Kansas Publications: Humanistic Studies," No. 30.) Lawrence, Kans.: University of Kansas Publications, 1952.

Simon, Marcel. *Verus Israel*. 2nd ed., enlarged. Paris: Editions E. de Boccard, 1964.

Sophocles, E. A. (ed.). *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*. Reprint; New York: F. Ungar Publishing Co., 1957.

"Special Sabbaths," *The Standard Jewish Encyclopedia*. Edited by Cecil Roth, *et al*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1959. P. 1634.

Stinespring, W. F. "Jerusalem Temple," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick, *et al*. 4 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. IV, 559.

Swete, H. B. An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1900.

Thomson, Charles (trans.). The Septuagint Bible. Ed., rev., and enlarged by C. A. Muses. 2nd ed. Indian Hills, Colo.: The Falcon's Wing Press, 1960.

Usener, Hermann. Das Weihnachtsfest, Chaps. I-III. ("Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen," Part I.) Bonn: Verlag von Max Cohen & Sohn, 1889.

Williams, Lukyn. Adversus Judaeos. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1935.

END

Microfilmed by
Department of Photoduplication
The University of Chicago Library
Swift Hall
Chicago 37, Illinois

FURTHER REPRODUCTION OF,
OR QUOTATION FROM, THIS
MATERIAL MAY NOT BE MADE
WITHOUT PERMISSION FROM
THE AUTHOR AND DEPARTMENT
GRANTING THE DEGREE.

Thesis No. T12872